

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Proposed Amendment and Administrative Adjustments to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) for Transit Projects

SUMMARY:

The FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) was approved by the MAG Regional Council on July 25, 2001. As a result of additional funding opportunities within the FY 2002 Federal Transportation Appropriations Bill, Valley Metro reviews the Federal Transit Administration Grant application that is under development and adjusts the projects in the Grant and in the TIP to ensure that the two programs are in conformance. As a result, Valley Metro has requested a TIP amendment that adds five new projects, plus another seven to replace four projects being deleted. In addition, Valley Metro has requested an administrative adjustment to fifteen transit projects. Please refer to the attached table. Proposed administrative adjustments to the TIP include four project advancements, two project deferrals, and nine project scope changes, all of which may be categorized as minor project revisions. All of the proposed new transit projects and the deletions, which require a TIP amendment for programming in FY 2002, may also be categorized as exempt. The new projects are funded by either Section 5307 or 5309 funds. Consultation on the conformity assessment for the proposed amendment and administrative adjustment is considered under a separate agenda item.

PUBLIC INPUT:

No direct public input has been received on this item, but an opportunity for public input was provided at the May 21, 2002, Transportation Review Committee meeting. Copies of the conformity assessment have been distributed for consultation purposes. Opportunities for public input and consultation are also scheduled for the June 12, 2002, meeting of the MAG Management Committee and the June 26, 2002 meeting of the MAG Regional Council.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: If approved, this revision would enable continuation of the Section 5307 and Section 5309 grant applications to the Federal Transit Administration for FY 2001.

CONS: If not approved, the requests for Federal Transit Administration funds will be jeopardized.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The proposed amendment will add five new projects to the FY 2002-2006 MAG TIP and a further seven projects to replace the four being deleted. Administrative adjustments are proposed on fifteen transit projects. These actions will allow the transit program to proceed.

POLICY: These changes are consistent with MAG policies for amending and adjusting the TIP.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approving an Amendment and Administrative Adjustments to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program for transit projects.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Transportation Review Committee: On May 21, 2002, the TRC unanimously recommended the Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair
Phoenix: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair
ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: David Fitzhugh
*Buckeye: Joe Blanton
Chandler: Patrice Kraus
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell
*Gila Bend: Shane Dille
Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Terry Johnson for Jim Book
Goodyear: Jerene Watson for Grant Anderson

*Guadalupe: Freddy Arteaga
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Ron Krosting
*Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Peoria: David Moody
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth for Ken Driggs
Scottsdale: Michelle Korf
Surprise: Miryam Gutier
Tempe: Mary O'Connor

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Pat McDermott,
Chandler
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix
*ITS Committee: Jim Book, Glendale

Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton,
Maricopa County Dept of Transportation
Telecommunications Advisory Group:
Jim Hull, Mesa

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

CONTACT PERSON:

Paul Ward, MAG, (602) 254-6300, or Bob Antila, RPTA, (602) 262-7889

FY02-06 TIP
Transit Requests for Adjustment/Amendment

ID #	Agency	NEW FY	Work Type	Fund Type	Local	Federal	Total	Change	
ADVANCEMENTS									
1	PHX00-901T1B	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 3 replace	5307	163,200	796,800	960,000	Advance from 2003, change from 5309 to 5307, and reduce from \$1,140,000 total
2	PHX01-916TAX	Phoenix	2002	Repayment for advance purchase bus: standard - 6 expand in FY 2001	5307	(1,832,640)	1,832,640	-	Advance from 2003
3	PHX03-208TRX	Phoenix	2002	Repayment for advance purchase bus: standard - 1 expand in FY 2001	5307	(265,600)	265,600	-	Advance from 2003
4	GLN03-201T	Glendale	2002	Purchase bus: < 30 foot - 2 expand	5309	35,486	173,255	208,741	Advance from 2003, increase from 1 bus to 2 buses, and increase from \$135,000 total
DEFERRALS									
1	MES01-003T	Mesa	2003	Construct park-and-ride (US-60/Power Rd)	5307	515,597	2,062,390	2,577,987	Defer from 2002
2	PHX02-237T	Phoenix	2003	Construct regional park-and-ride (I-10/Elliott Rd)	Local	2,350,000	-	2,350,000	Defer from 2002 and reduce from \$3,000,000 total
ADJUSTMENTS									
1	MMA02-01T	Maricopa County	2002	Purchase bus: < 30 foot - 3 replace	5307	39,000	156,000	195,000	Reduce from \$219,000 total
2	PHX02-104T	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: < 30 foot - 6 replace (HSD)	Local	390,000	-	390,000	Change from 5307 to 100% local
3	PHX02-201T	Phoenix	2002	Acquire land regional park-and-ride (I-10/Chandler Blvd)	5307	120,000	480,000	600,000	Reduce from \$1,856,575 total
4	PHX02-205T	Phoenix	2002	Install bus stop passenger improvements (TE)	5307	65,582	262,326	327,908	Increase from \$308,275 total for federal "transit enhancement" requirement
5	PHX02-06T	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: 40 foot - lease/purchase payment	5309	329,321	1,607,863	1,937,184	Reduce from \$2,211,00 total
6	PHX00-904T	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 5 replace	STP-FLEX	115,688	1,913,928	2,029,616	Increase from \$1,950,000 total
7	RPT02-104T	RPTA	2002	Purchase vanpools: 40 replace (contractor owned)	STP-FLEX	-	1,080,000	1,080,000	Increase from \$1,060,000 total
8	TMP02-912T	Tempe	2002	Install bus stop passenger improvments	Local	200,000	-	200,000	Change from 5307 to 100% local
9	SCT02-005T	Scottsdale	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 5 expand	5307	272,000	1,328,000	1,600,000	Reduce from 10 buses to 5 buses
DELETIONS									
1	MES02-202T	Mesa	N/A	Construct Operations Facility	5309	2,328,839	9,315,354	11,644,193	Replace with "NEW" Project
2	PHX02-106T	Phoenix	N/A	Purchase bus: standard - 14 expand	local	4,480,000	-	4,480,000	Replace with "NEW" Projects
3	PHX01-910T	Phoenix	N/A	Purchase and install bus communication system (AVL)	5309	184,366	3,050,134	3,234,500	Replaced by "NEW" Project
4	PHX04-117TB	Phoenix	N/A	Purchase bus: standard - 17 expand	5307	924,800	4,515,200	5,440,000	Replace with "NEW" Project
ADDITIONS									
1	NEW	Mesa	2002	Construct Operations Facility	5309	10,966,160	4,000,000	14,966,160	Replaces MES02-202T
2	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 8 expand	5307	435,200	2,124,800	2,560,000	Replaces PHX02-106T
3	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 6 expand	5309	332,564	1,623,693	1,956,257	Replaces PHX02-106T
4	NEW	Mesa	2002	Purchase and install vehicle management system	5307	8,260	33,039	41,299	
5	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Purchase and install vehicle management system	5307	6,325,974	629,026	6,955,000	Replaces PHX01-910T
6	NEW	RPTA	2002	Purchase and install vehicle management system	5307	26,686	106,744	133,430	
7	NEW	Tempe	2002	Purchase and install vehicle management system	5307	70,181	280,722	350,903	
8	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Pre-design - West Valley Operations Facility	5309	120,000	480,000.00	600,000	
9	NEW	Tempe	2002	Pre-design - East Valley Operations Facility	5309	120,000	480,000.00	600,000	
10	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Advance Purchase bus: Commuter - 12 expand	5307	4,800,000	-	4,800,000	Replaces PHX04-117TB
11	NEW	Phoenix	2004	Repayment of advance Purchase bus: Commuter - 12 expand	5307	(3,984,000)	3,984,000	-	Replaces PHX04-117TB
12	NEW	Phoenix	2004	Purchase bus: standard - 2 expand	5307	108,800	531,200	640,000	Replaces PHX04-117TB

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Consultant Selection for the 2002 MAG Travel Speed Study

SUMMARY:

The FY 2002 MAG Unified Planning Work Program includes \$300,000 to conduct a regional travel speed study. The travel speed data will be used to calibrate the MAG travel demand model, to accommodate the needs of MAG member agencies, traffic engineers, and the general public. MAG has produced travel speed studies every seven to nine years since 1966. The last regional traffic travel speed study was conducted in 1993. With rapid population growth and change of traffic patterns in the MAG region, it is necessary to conduct a new travel speed study and update our database.

The consultant will collect travel time data on 1,600 centerline miles of freeways and arterials in the MAG urbanized area. Data will be collected for the AM peak period, the midday, and the PM peak period. The data will be collected using GPS units so that the delay at major intersections will be analyzed. In addition the consultant has proposed to produce a video database of the surveyed streets.

The request for proposals was advertised in March 2002. Seven proposals were received. On May 2, 2002, a multi jurisdictional consultant evaluation group reviewed the proposals and selected four to be interviewed. On May 10, 2002, the same multi jurisdictional consultant evaluation group interviewed the four firms and reached a consensus to select Carter Burgess to conduct the study for an amount not to exceed \$300,000.

PUBLIC INPUT:

No public input was received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: This survey will result in a current database of travel speeds on freeways and arterials in the MAG region. The accuracy of speed data is important to the annual process of evaluating the conformity of transportation plans to state and federal air quality implementation plans.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: This survey will enable the MAG travel demand model to be calibrated more accurately and provide more accurate baseline data for many transportation engineering and planning studies.

POLICY: This data will show where travel speeds have increased or decreased since 1993 and will result in more informed decisions with regard to prioritizing various transportation projects.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommendation for Carter Burgess, Inc. to conduct the 2002 MAG Travel Speed Study for an amount not to exceed \$300,000.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

On May 10, 2002 the consultant evaluation group reached a consensus that Carter Burgess be selected to conduct the 2002 MAG Travel Speed Study for an amount not to exceed \$300,000.

Mike Mah, City of Chandler
Don Herp, City of Phoenix
Alan Grover, City of Glendale
Yogesh Mantri, MCDOT
Ron Amaya, City of Peoria
Jim Decker, City of Tempe
Andrew Smith, ADOT
Mark Schlappi, MAG

CONTACT PERSON:

Ratna Korepella, MAG (602) 254-6300

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Consultant Selection for the MAG 2002 Traffic Volume Survey

SUMMARY:

The FY 2002 MAG Unified Planning Work Program includes \$80,000 to conduct a regional arterial traffic volume survey. The traffic volume data will be used to calibrate the MAG travel demand model, to accommodate the needs of MAG member agencies, traffic engineers, and the general public. MAG has produced traffic count maps every two or three years since 1974. The last regional traffic volume survey was conducted in 1998. A count map was produced from this data in 1999. With rapid population growth and change of traffic patterns in the MAG region, it is necessary to conduct a new traffic volume survey and update our database. In the future we hope to collect traffic volumes at the same locations every two years and provide this information on the MAG web site.

The project goal is to have at least one traffic count for approximately every other mile section of arterial roadway in the MAG urbanized area. MAG has determined locations where counts from member agencies can be used in the traffic count database. Traffic counts not being done by MAG member agencies will be collected by the consultant.

On April 10, 2002, a Request for Proposals was advertised. Two proposals were received. These proposals were from United Civil Group (UCG) and Traffic Research & Analysis, Inc. (TRA). On May 8, 2002, a multi jurisdictional consultant evaluation group reviewed the proposals, interviewed the two firms, and reached a consensus to select TRA to conduct the study for an amount not to exceed \$80,000.

PUBLIC INPUT:

No public input was received.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: This survey will result in a consistent comprehensive current database of traffic volumes in the MAG region.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: This survey will enable the MAG travel demand model to be calibrated more accurately and provide more accurate baseline data for many transportation engineering and planning studies.

POLICY: This data could result in more informed decisions with regards to prioritizing various transportation projects.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommendation to select Traffic Research & Analysis, Inc. to conduct the 2002 Traffic Volume Survey for an amount not to exceed \$80,000.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

On May 8, 2002, the consultant evaluation group reached a consensus that Traffic Research & Analysis, Inc. be selected to conduct the 2002 Traffic Volume Survey for an amount not to exceed \$80,000.

Donald Herp, City of Phoenix
Joe Flaherty, ADOT
Nicolaas Swart, MCDOT
Jamie Blakeman, City of Mesa
Mark Schlappi, MAG

CONTACT PERSON:

Qing Xia, MAG (602) 254-6300

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Amendment of MAG Transportation Model Enhancements Consultant Contract for Station Demand Forecasting

SUMMARY:

The FY 2002 MAG Unified Planning Work Program includes a \$100,000 project to enhance the MAG model. These improvements include: reformulate the mode choice model nesting structure as suggested by FTA, develop analytical reporting procedures to provide information desired by FTA, and enhance the trip distribution model as suggested by FTA. MAG currently has Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas under contract to make enhancements to the mode choice model. The funding from the Work Program would increase the current contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas from \$412,908 to \$512,908.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The model enhancements will result in better transit ridership forecasts and reduce the amount of time required to summarize the results of various transit scenarios.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: These enhancements will have four benefits: (1) The MAG mode choice model will provide more reasonable estimates of HOV lane use and express bus ridership. (2) The MAG model produces an enormous amount of information related to transit travel. This task will sort through this information and determine the most useful way of reporting it. (3) The MAG non-work trip distribution model will produce more accurate estimates of travel patterns for transit dependent riders.

POLICY: LRT transit forecasts will be more accurate and information required by FTA will be more easily understood and produced quicker.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommendation to amend the consultant contract with Parsons Brinckerhoff Quade & Douglas for transportation model enhancements from \$412,908 to \$512,908.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

None.

CONTACT PERSON:

Mark Schlappi, (602) 254-6300.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... *for your review*

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Conformity Consultation

SUMMARY:

The Valley Metro/Regional Public Transportation Authority has requested a proposed amendment and administrative adjustment to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as a result of additional funding opportunities within the FY 2002 Federal Transportation Appropriations Bill. The TIP amendment is required to add twelve new transit projects. The administrative adjustment involves minor project revisions to fifteen transit projects. The transit projects are described in the attached interagency consultation memorandum.

In addition, as part of the FY 2002 MAG Federal Funds Interim Closeout, an amendment and administrative adjustment is proposed to defer, advance, and add new projects to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and to the Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program. The projects for the FY 2002 MAG Federal Funds Interim Closeout are described in the attached interagency consultation memorandum.

MAG has reviewed the projects for compliance with the federal transportation conformity rule and has found that the amendments require consultation on the conformity assessment. The administrative adjustment involves minor project revisions for which a conformity determination is not required. The amendments include new projects that may be categorized as exempt, for which a conformity determination is not required.

PUBLIC INPUT:

Copies of the conformity assessment have been distributed for consultation purposes to the Federal Highway Administration, Federal Transit Administration, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, Arizona Department of Transportation, Regional Public Transportation Authority, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and other interested parties including members of the public. Comments on the conformity assessment are requested by June 21, 2002.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Interagency consultation for the amendment notifies the planning partners of project modifications in the TIP.

CONS: The review of conformity assessment requires additional time in the project approval process.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The amendments may not be considered until the consultation process for the conformity assessment is completed.

POLICY: The conformity assessment and consultation is prepared in accordance with MAG Conformity Consultation Processes adopted by the Regional Council in February 1996, and with MAG Transportation Conformity Guidance and Procedures adopted by the Regional Council in March 1996. In addition, federal guidance is followed in response to court rulings regarding transportation conformity.

ACTION NEEDED:

For consultation.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Transportation Review Committee: On May 21, 2002, the TRC unanimously recommended the Amendment and Administrative Adjustment to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair
Phoenix: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair
ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: David Fitzhugh
*Buckeye: Joe Blanton
Chandler: Patrice Kraus
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell
*Gila Bend: Shane Dille
Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Terry Johnson for Jim Book
Goodyear: Jerene Watson for Grant Anderson

*Guadalupe: Freddy Arteaga
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Ron Krosting
*Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Peoria: David Moody
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth for Ken Driggs
Scottsdale: Michelle Korf
Surprise: Miryam Gutier
Tempe: Mary O'Connor

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Pat McDermott, Chandler
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix
*ITS Committee: Jim Book, Glendale

Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton,
Maricopa County Dept of Transportation
Telecommunications Advisory Group:
Jim Hull, Mesa

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Transportation Review Committee: On May 21, 2002, the TRC recommended, by a vote of sixteen yes and one no (*italics*), the following actions with regard to the FFY 2002 Interim Close Out:

1. Add one Goodyear project (\$80,000, CMAQ) to the deferred list;
2. Utilize the funds available to: (a) advance a \$2,500,000 CMAQ light rail design funded project from FY 2005 and \$6,000,000 from FY 2006; (b) advance a \$480,000 Glendale STP-MAG Major Investment Study from FY 2007; and (c) advance \$475,000 from a Peoria CMAQ Traffic Signal Project from FY 2004;
3. Reserve the remaining funds for FY 2002.

These actions leave approximately \$1.85 million yet to utilize, although previous Regional Council action has allocated \$1,500,000 for the Special Census. Additional recommendations will be forthcoming regarding any further funds that may be received during the remainder of the year, including any redistributed OA that may be received.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair
Phoenix: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair
ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: David Fitzhugh
*Buckeye: Joe Blanton
Chandler: Patrice Kraus
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell
*Gila Bend: Shane Dille
Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Terry Johnson for Jim Book
Goodyear: Jerene Watson for Grant Anderson

*Guadalupe: Freddy Arteaga
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Ron Krosting
*Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Peoria: David Moody
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth for Ken Driggs
Scottsdale: Michelle Korf
Surprise: Miryam Gutier
Tempe: Mary O'Connor

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Pat McDermott,
Chandler
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix
*ITS Committee: Jim Book, Glendale

Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton,
Maricopa County Dept of Transportation
Telecommunications Advisory Group:
Jim Hull, Mesa

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Transportation Review Committee: On April 23, 2002, the TRC unanimously recommended the deferral of ten projects from FY 2002 to FY 2003 and one project from FY 2002 to FY 2004. The TRC deferred action on which projects to recommend to utilize the available funding until the following month's meeting.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair
Phoenix: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair
ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: David Fitzhugh
Buckeye: Joe Blanton
Chandler: Patrice Kraus
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell
*Gila Bend: Shane Dille
Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Jim Book
Goodyear: Grant Anderson

Guadalupe: Freddy Arteaga for Mark Johnson
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Ron Krosting
Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Peoria: David Moody
RPTA: Ken Driggs
Scottsdale: Michelle Korf
Surprise: Miryam Gutier
Tempe: Mary O'Connor

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Pat McDermott,
Chandler
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix
ITS Committee: Jim Book, Glendale

Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton,
Maricopa County Dept of Transportation
*Telecommunications Advisory Group:
Jim Hull, Mesa

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

CONTACT PERSON:

Dean Giles, MAG, (602) 254-6300.

June 4, 2002

TO: Leslie Rogers, Federal Transit Administration
Robert Hollis, Federal Highway Administration
Victor Mendez, Arizona Department of Transportation
Jacqueline Schafer, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality
Ken Driggs, Regional Public Transportation Authority
Al Brown, Maricopa County Environmental Services Department
Colleen McKaughan, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region IX
Other Interested Parties

FROM: Dean Giles, Air Quality Planner

SUBJECT: CONSULTATION ON CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT FOR A PROPOSED
AMENDMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT TO THE FY 2002-2006
MAG TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND TO THE DRAFT
FY 2003-2007 MAG TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The Valley Metro/Regional Public Transportation Authority has requested a proposed amendment and administrative adjustment to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) as a result of additional funding opportunities within the FY 2002 Federal Transportation Appropriations Bill. The TIP amendment is required to add twelve new transit projects and the administrative adjustment involves minor project revisions to fifteen transit projects (see Attachment B). In addition, as part of the FY 2002 MAG Federal Funds Interim Closeout, an amendment and administrative adjustment is proposed to defer, advance and add new projects to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and to the Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program.(see Attachment C). The proposed amendments and administrative adjustments, as well as the consultation for the corresponding conformity assessment, are on the agenda for the June 12, 2002 meeting of the MAG Management Committee and the June 26, 2002 meeting of the MAG Regional Council. Comments on the conformity assessment are requested by **June 21, 2002**.

MAG has reviewed the projects for compliance with the federal conformity rule and has found that the amendments and administrative adjustments require consultation on the conformity assessment. The amendments include new projects that may be categorized as exempt, for which a conformity determination is not required. The administrative adjustments involve minor project revisions for which a conformity determination is not required. The current conformity finding of the TIP and the associated Long Range Transportation Plan 2001 Update that was made jointly by the Federal Highway Administration and Federal Transit Administration in a letter dated August 16, 2001, remains unchanged by this action. The results of the Draft 2002 Conformity Analysis for the Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG TIP and LRTP 2002 Update would be unchanged by this action. This conformity assessment is being transmitted for consultation purposes to the agencies listed above and to other interested parties. If you have any questions or comments, please contact me at (602) 254-6300.

cc: Nancy Wrona, Arizona Department of Environmental Quality

ATTACHMENT A

CONFORMITY ASSESSMENT FOR A PROPOSED AMENDMENT AND ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENT TO THE FY 2002-2006 MAG TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AND TO THE DRAFT FY 2003-2007 MAG TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

The federal transportation conformity rule requires consultation when making modifications to the TIP and Long Range Transportation Plan. Consultation is also a requirement of the Arizona Conformity Rule. This information is provided for consultation purposes in accordance with the federal and state conformity procedures mentioned above as well as the processes outlined in the MAG Conformity Consultation Processes document adopted by the MAG Regional Council on February 28, 1996.

The amendments include new projects which may be categorized as exempt. Types of projects considered exempt are defined in the federal transportation conformity rule. A conformity determination is not required for exempt projects.

The administrative adjustments involve minor project revisions such as funding changes; scope changes that do not alter the number of through traffic lanes more than one-half mile; changes to the programmed implementation year with the five-years addressed in the TIP; and design, right-of-way, or utility projects. A conformity determination is not required for administrative adjustments.

The projects included in the proposed amendments and administrative adjustments to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and the Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program are addressed in Attachment B and Attachment C. MAG has reviewed the projects for compliance with the federal conformity rule and found that the projects require consultation on the conformity assessment. The projects are not expected to create adverse emission impacts or interfere with Transportation Control Measure implementation. The results of the 2001 Conformity Analysis for the TIP and Long Range Transportation Plan 2001 Update would be unchanged by this action. Also, the results of the Draft 2002 Conformity Analysis for the Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG TIP and LRTP 2002 Update would be unchanged by this action.

FY2002-2006 MAG TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM - Transit Adjustment Requests

ID #	Agency	NEW FY	Work Type	Fund Type	Local	Federal	Total	Change	Conformity Assessment	
ADVANCEMENTS										
1	PHX00-901T1B	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 3 replace	5307	163,200	796,800	960,000	Advance from 2003, change from 5309 to 5307, and reduce from \$1,140,000 total	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation and funding sources.
2	PHX01-916TAX	Phoenix	2002	Repayment for advance purchase bus: standard - 6 expand in FY 2001	5307	(1,832,640)	1,832,640	-	Advance from 2003	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation schedule.
3	PHX03-208TRX	Phoenix	2002	Repayment for advance purchase bus: standard - 1 expand in FY 2001	5307	(265,600)	265,600	-	Advance from 2003	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation schedule.
4	GLN03-201T	Glendale	2002	Purchase bus: < 30 foot - 2 expand	5309	35,486	173,255	208,741	Advance from 2003, increase from 1 bus to 2 buses, and increase from \$135,000 total	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation schedule and funding.
DEFERRALS										
1	MES01-003T	Mesa	2003	Construct park-and-ride (US-60/Power Rd)	5307	515,597	2,062,390	2,577,987	Defer from 2002	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation schedule.
2	PHX02-237T	Phoenix	2002	Construct regional park-and-ride (I-10/Elliott Rd)	Local	2,350,000	-	2,350,000	Defer from 2002 and reduce from \$3,000,000 total	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation schedule and funding.
ADJUSTMENTS										
1	MMA02-01T	Maricopa County	2002	Purchase bus: < 30 foot - 3 replace	5307	39,000	156,000	195,000	Reduce from \$219,000 total	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.
2	PHX02-104T	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: < 30 foot - 6 replace (HSD)	Local	390,000	-	390,000	Change from 5307 to 100% local	Minor project revision required for change in project funding source.
3	PHX02-201T	Phoenix	2002	Acquire land regional park-and-ride (I-10/Chandler Blvd)	5307	120,000	480,000	600,000	Reduce from \$1,856,575 total	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.

ADJUSTMENTS (con't)										
4	PHX02-205T	Phoenix	2002	Install bus stop passenger improvements (TE)	5307	65,582	262,326	327,908	Increase from \$308,275 total for federal "transit enhancement" requirement	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.
5	PHX02-06T	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: 40 foot - lease/purchase payment	5309	329,321	1,607,863	1,937,184	Reduce from \$2,211,00 total	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.
6	PHX00-904T	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 5 replace	STP-FLEX	115,688	1,913,928	2,029,616	Increase from \$1,950,000 total	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.
7	RPT02-104T	RPTA	2002	Purchase vanpools: 40 replace (contractor owned)	STP-FLEX	-	1,080,000	1,080,000	Increase from \$1,060,000 total	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.
8	TMP02-912T	Tempe		Install bus stop passenger improvments	Local	200,000	-	200,000	Change from 5307 to 100% local	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.
9	SCT02-005T	Scottsdale	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 5 expand	5307	272,000	1,328,000	1,600,000	Reduce from 10 buses to 5 buses	Minor project revision required for change in project scope.
DELETIONS										
1	MES02-202T	Mesa		Construct Operations Facility	5309	2,328,839	9,315,354	11,644,193	Replace with "NEW" Project	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.
2	PHX02-106T	Phoenix		Purchase bus: standard - 14 expand	local	4,480,000	-	4,480,000	Replace with "NEW" Projects	Minor project revision required for change in project funding source.
3	PHX01-910T	Phoenix		Purchase and install bus communication system (AVL)	5309	184,366	3,050,134	3,234,500	Replaced by "NEW" Project	Minor project revision required for change in project funding source.
4	PHX04-117TB	Phoenix		Purchase bus: standard - 17 expand	5307	924,800	4,515,200	5,440,000	Replace with "NEW" Project	Minor project revision required for change in project funding source.
ADDITIONS										
1	NEW	Mesa	2002	Construct Operations Facility	5309	10,966,160	4,000,000	14,966,160	Replaces MES02-202T	Minor project revision required for change in project funding.
2	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 8 expand	5307	435,200	2,124,800	2,560,000	Replaces PHX02-106T	Minor project revision required for change in project funding source.

ADDITIONS (con't)										
3	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Purchase bus: standard - 6 expand	5309	332,564	1,623,693	1,956,257	Replaces PHX02-106T	Minor project revision required for change in project funding source.
4	NEW	Mesa	2002	Purchase and install vehicle management system	5307	8,260	33,039	41,299		Exempt under the category: Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g. radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.)
5	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Purchase and install vehicle management system	5307	6,325,974	629,026	6,955,000	Replaces PHX01-910T	Minor project revision required for change in project funding source.
6	NEW	RPTA	2002	Purchase and install vehicle management system	5307	26,686	106,744	133,430		Exempt under the category: Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g. radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.)
7	NEW	Tempe	2002	Purchase and install vehicle management system	5307	70,181	280,722	350,903		Exempt under the category: Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g. radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.)
8	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Pre-design - West Valley Operations Facility	5309	120,000	480,000	600,000		Exempt under the category: Construction of new bus or rail storage/maintenance facilities categorically excluded in 23 CFR part 771.
9	NEW	Tempe	2002	Pre-design - East Valley Operations Facility	5309	120,000	480,000	600,000		Exempt under the category: Construction of new bus or rail storage/maintenance facilities categorically excluded in 23 CFR part 771.
10	NEW	Phoenix	2002	Advance Purchase bus: Commuter - 12 expand	5307	4,800,000	-	4,800,000	Replaces PHX04-117TB	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation and funding sources.
11	NEW	Phoenix	2004	Repayment of advance Purchase bus: Commuter - 12 expand	5307	(3,984,000)	3,984,000	-	Replaces PHX04-117TB	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation and funding sources.
12	NEW	Phoenix	2004	Purchase bus: standard - 2 expand	5307	108,800	531,200	640,000	Replaces PHX04-117TB	Minor project revision required for changes in project implementation and funding sources.

Amendment/Adjustments to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program								
Proj #	Agency	Description	Funding	Local	Federal	Total	Action	Conformity Assessment
RPT02-327T	RPTA	Regionwide: Regional light rail - design	CMAQ	\$515,000	\$8,500,000	\$9,015,000	Add new project to FY 2002 (replaces RPT05-206T and RPT06-224T)	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
RPT05-206T	RPTA	Regionwide: Regional light rail - final design, right of way and construction	CMAQ	\$152,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,652,000	Delete project from 2005	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
RPT06-224T	RPTA	Regionwide: Regional light rail - final design, right of way and construction	CMAQ	\$393,000	\$6,500,000	\$6,893,000	Delete project from 2006	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
RPT06-224TR	RPTA	Regionwide: Regional light rail - final design, right of way and construction	CMAQ	\$30,225	\$500,000	\$530,225	Add new project in FY 2006 (replaces RPT06-224T)	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.

Proj #	Agency	Description	Funding	Local	Federal	Total	Action	Conformity Assessment
GLN07-314	Glendale	US-60 (Grand Ave): I-17 to Agua Fria Fwy; MIS Phase II	STP-MAG	\$29,100	\$480,000	\$509,100	Add new project to FY 2002	Exempt under the category: Engineering to assess social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed action or alternatives to that action.
PEO02-004	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$57,000	\$943,000	\$1,000,000	Delete project from FY 2002	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule and funding.
PEO02-004R	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$86,000	\$1,418,000	\$1,504,000	Add new project in FY 2002 (replaces PEO02-004)	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule and funding.
PEO04-103	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$57,000	\$943,000	\$1,000,000	Delete project from FY 2004	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule and funding.

Proj #	Agency	Description	Funding	Local	Federal	Total	Action	Conformity Assessment
PEO04-103R	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$28,289	\$468,000	\$496,289	Add new project in FY 2004 (replaces PEO04-103)	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule and funding.
MAG02-312	MAG	Regionwide: Set-a-side funding for Special Census	STP-MAG	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	Add new project to FY 2002	Exempt under the category: Planning and technical studies.
Proj #	Agency	Description	Funding	Federal		Action		Conformity Assessment
CHN02-012	Chandler	Consolidated Canal: Ryan Rd to Riggs Rd; construct multi-use path	CMAQ	\$707,250		Defer project from 2002 to 2003		Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
GLB01-002R	Gilbert	Consolidated Canal (Heritage Trl): Warner to Freestone Pk; construct multi-use path	CMAQ	\$377,800		Defer project from 2002 to 2003		Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
GLN01-001	Glendale	Bell Rd: 51st Ave to 83rd Ave; install computerized signal system (Phase 2)	CMAQ	\$665,000		Defer project from 2002 to 2003		Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
GDY01-101C	Goodyear	Rainbow Valley Rd: Riggs Rd to Hunt Hwy; pave dirt road (phase I)	CMAQ	\$80,000		Defer project from 2002 to 2003		Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
MES02-006	Mesa	Consolidated Canal: Lindsay Rd to Baseline Rd; construct multi-use path	CMAQ	\$447,925		Defer project from 2002 to 2003		Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.

MES01-9 17R	Mesa	Stapley Dr: Baseline Rd to McKellips Rd; Install traffic control signal system	CMAQ	\$339,480	Defer project from 2002 to 2003	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
Proj #	Agency	Description	Funding	Federal	Action	Conformity Assessment
PEO02-003	Peoria	83rd Ave at Thunderbird Rd; construct additional turn lanes	CMAQ	\$565,800	Defer project from 2002 to 2003	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
PEO02-005	Peoria	New River Rd: Northern Ave to Peoria Ave; construct multi-use path	CMAQ	\$440,722	Defer project from 2002 to 2003	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
PHX01-014RW	Phoenix	Maryland Ave at I-17; acquire ROW for bicycle overpass	CMAQ	\$943,000	Defer project from 2002 to 2003	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
PHX02-105	Phoenix	Various locations: pave dirt shoulders (phase 1)	CMAQ	\$830,000	Defer project from 2002 to 2003	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.
TMP02-006	Tempe	Rio Salado Pkwy: Mill Ave to Priest Ave; construct multi-use path on south bank	CMAQ	\$943,000	Defer project from 2002 to 2004	Minor project revision required for changes to the project schedule.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... *for your review*

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Homeless Continuum of Care Recommendations

SUMMARY:

On December 8, 1999, the Regional Council approved MAG becoming the responsible entity for a year round homeless planning process which includes submittal of the HUD Stuart B. McKinney Continuum of Care Consolidated Application for Maricopa County. The Continuum of Care grant supports transitional and permanent housing and supportive services. Last year, the region received \$9.2 million. A Continuum of Care Steering Committee was formed and chaired by former Chief Justice Frank Gordon. MAG received 31 applications from nonprofit organizations in the Valley on May 8, 2002. A ranking and review process, administered by the Valley of the Sun United Way, will be completed by June 7, 2002. The Regional Council Executive Committee will be requested to comment on the application on June 17, 2002, before the grant is submitted to the Department of Housing and Urban Development on June 21, 2002.

PUBLIC INPUT:

The development of the vision, goals, objectives, evaluation criteria and request for proposals was crafted based on public input from consumers, providers of services, local and state governmental representatives.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: A coordinated application and planning process is recommended by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development to maximize competitiveness for the federal Stewart B. McKinney Act funds. Working groups composed of stakeholders were involved from the inception of the planning process and remained involved throughout. Using this model, there has been widespread consensus about the types of issues related to homelessness in the Valley and assistance with information needed for the federal grant.

CONS: The need for consensus about community priorities is sometimes difficult, because of the magnitude of problems associated with homelessness and the lack of sufficient resources to meet the needs of all of the different populations. Another complication that the process had to address was the class action lawsuit, *Arnold v. Sarn*, requiring services to persons with serious mental illness. Approximately 1,000 homeless people with serious mental illness in Maricopa County are housed using rental vouchers provided by this grant. Replacement funding from local sources is needed to maintain this capacity in the future because the federal funds are intended as short-term support, and not as a permanent source of funds for homeless people with serious mental illness.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: The federal application process requires a tremendous amount of staff time to develop the community consensus and to gather the information asked for by HUD. This task is complicated by the lack of a consistent data base on needs, services provided and funds expended. The planning process has identified the need to develop more complete data for the next application through a comprehensive county-wide street count and shelter survey. The implementation of the Maricopa Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) will also assist in the collection of system-wide data in future years. This implementation process is scheduled to begin in the fall of 2002 and will take at least three years to complete.

POLICY: The Homeless Continuum of Care Steering Committee was created with the approval of the MAG Regional Council. This policy level council is composed of a variety of representatives, including elected officials, representatives of the Governor's Office, several state legislators, several funding agencies, service providers, HUD, the religious community, advocates and consumers. This is the first broad-based community committee that has agreed to take the responsibility for homeless planning and to ensure that a regional grant application is submitted each year. The Committee has been an effective method to discuss and move forward with regional solutions addressing homelessness.

ACTION NEEDED:

For information.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

The Homeless Continuum of Care Steering Committee have reviewed the proposal review and ranking criteria and related materials at their meeting on April 25, 2002. They have approved the criteria and contents related to the application and serve as the policy body related to the homeless issue. The final rankings will be reviewed for comment by the MAG Regional Council Executive Committee on June 17, 2002 and then submitted for approval to the Homeless Continuum of Care Steering Committee at their meeting on June 17, 2002.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

- | | |
|---|---|
| Riann Balch, AZ Coalition to End Homelessness | * Ryan Johnson, CHS, Inc.
Donald P. Keuth, Phoenix Community Alliance |
| * Jody Beckley, Office of the Governor | * Sandy Perez, Arizona Community Foundation |
| * Mike Bielecki, Office of the Governor | * Ethel Lane, Downtown Southwest Neighborhood Association |
| Jan Brewer, Maricopa County Supervisor, Vice Chairman | Anne Lipp, Area Agency on Aging, HIV Care Directions |
| * Dennis Cahill, Councilmember of Tempe | Marvin Martin, Phoenix Revitalization Corp. |
| Tom Canasi, City of Tempe, Planning Subcommittee Chairman | Tiffany Huisman for Peggy Neely, Councilmember of Phoenix |
| Sally Ordini for James Cavanaugh, Councilmember of Goodyear | * Carol McCormick, Mesa United Way |
| * Vanessa Chang, Consumer Representative | Guy Mikkelsen, Catholic Diocese |
| Patrick Chorpenning, AZ Dept. of Veterans Affairs | Sara Moya, AZ Homeless Trust Fund |
| Diana Yazzie Devine, Native American Connections | David Ortega, Councilmember of Scottsdale |
| Sandra Dowling, Maricopa County School Superintendent | * Beth Rosenberg, Children's Action Alliance |
| Vicki Staples for Cathy Eden, AZ Dept of Health Services | * Tom Smith, Arizona Senator |
| Steve Frate, Councilmember of Glendale | * Dick Sousa, Councilmember of Goodyear |
| Ken Einbinder, HUD, <i>ex officio</i> | Margot Cordova for Brian Spicker, Valley of the Sun United Way |
| * Frank X. Gordon, Chief Justice Retired, Chairman | Louisa Stark, Consortium for the Homeless |
| * Phil Gordon, Councilmember of Phoenix | * Margaret Trujillo for Michael Zent, Value Options |
| * Mary Lou Hanley, AZ Department of Economic Security | Annette Stein for Johnathan Weisbuch, Maricopa County Dept of Public Health |
| Sheila Harris, Governor's Office of Housing Development | * Mary Rose Wilcox, Maricopa County Supervisor |
| * Edmundo Hildago, Chicanos por la Causa | Barbara Williams, AZ Housing Commission and The Collaboration for a New Century |

*Those members neither present nor represented by a proxy

CONTACT PERSON:

Suzanne Quigley, Human Services Program Manager, 602-254-6300

2002 HUD McKinney Grant Applications Summary
Maricopa Continuum of Care
4-Jun-02

Project Sponsor	Applicant	Project Name	Project Description	New / Renewal	Funding Request
AZ Behavioral Health Corp.	AZ Behavioral Health Corp.	HUD-57 (Permanent Housing for the Disabled)	Leasing and supportive services. Permanent housing for persons with disabilities and their families.	New	499,972
House of Refuge East	AZ Behavioral Health Corp.	House of Refuge East	Operations and supportive services. 86 two-bedroom houses on the former Williams Air Force Base in Mesa AZ	Renewal	903,424
NOVA - Northwest Organization for Voluntary Alternatives	AZ Behavioral Health Corp.	Safe Haven	Leasing and support services. Overnight shelter for 25 residents and supportive services to 25 day clients.	Renewal	1,114,796
Area Agency on Aging: Stepping Stones Place	City of Phoenix	Case Management at Stepping Stone	Supportive services. On-site case management to maintain permanent housing via a specialized program.	Renewal	60,735
Community Information & Referral	City of Phoenix	CONTACTS - Community Network for Accessing Shelter	Computer access to availability of shelter in a centralized location.	Renewal	168,336
HomeBase Youth Shelter, Inc.	City of Phoenix	Transitional Living Program	Transitional housing programs operations and case management services. Apartment complex in central Phoenix.	Renewal	333,363
Homeward Bound	City of Phoenix	Transitional Housing & Services	Operations and supportive services. Case management, employment services and mental health counseling.	Renewal	27,493
Homeward Bound	City of Phoenix	Transitional Housing & Services	Operations and supportive services. Thunderbird Family Village, case management, employment services and mental health counseling.	Renewal	119,974
Homeward Bound	Homeward Bound	Transitional Housing & Services	Operations and supportive services. Learning Center collaboration with YMCA child care staff; case management, anger management, and other intervention strategies.	New	55,282
Homeward Bound	City of Phoenix	Transitional Housing & Services	Supportive services. Continuation of comprehensive social services, case management, employment services and mental health counseling.	Renewal	209,475
Labor's Community Service	City of Phoenix	Transitional Housing	Operations. Affordable housing primarily for chronically homeless families with 3+ children.	Renewal	38,679
META Services, Inc.	City of Phoenix	Another Chance	Operations and supportive services. Access to Section 8 housing, employment services, community job training via case management services. ILS skill building and detox services	Renewal	971,974
Native American Connections	City of Phoenix	Stepping Stone	Operations and Supportive Services. Case management, cook, transportation, job training, substance abuse treatment.	Renewal	91,403

2002 HUD McKinney Grant Applications Summary
Maricopa Continuum of Care
4-Jun-02

Project Sponsor	Applicant	Project Name	Project Description	New / Renewal	Funding Request
Native American Connections	City of Phoenix	Louisa's Place/Catherine Arms	Operations and Supportive Services	Renewal	169,577
Phoenix Shanti Group	City of Phoenix	Self Determination Project	Supportive Services. Job training, employment assistance, basic job access skills	Renewal	36,330
The Salvation Army	City of Phoenix	Project HOPE	Support services , staff. Mobile outreach van providing on-site services and referrals to clients.	Renewal	75,600
Tumbleweed Center For Youth Development	City of Phoenix	Transitional Living Continuum	Operations and Support Services. Housing, ILS, counseling, case management, job readiness, employment assistance, parenting education, and educational development.	Renewal	457,912
Tumbleweed Center For Youth Development	City of Phoenix	Drop-In Center & Street Outreach	Operations and Support Services. Drop In Center and Street Outreach - services and housing referrals	Renewal	331,887
Chicanos Por La Causa	Chicanos Por La Causa	De Colores	Operations and Support Services. Comprehensive services to enable women to learn skills to escape domestic violence, obtain jobs, and progress to transitional housing from crisis services.	Renewal	101,737
Forgotten Warriors	Forgotten Warriors	Transitional Housing Program	Operations and Support Services. Housing and commaraderie for homeless Veterans. Various service programs and projects. Employment in on-site telemarketing company.	New	1,000,000
AZ Behavioral Health Corp.	Governor's Office of Housing Development	S+C 93	Operations and Support Services. Tenant based rental assistance in 93 scattered site units. ILS, other services to promote independence.	Renewal	742,020
AZ Behavioral Health Corp.	Governor's Office of Housing Development	S+C 200	Operations and Support Services. Tenant based rental assistance in 200 scattered site units. ILS, other services to promote independence.	Renewal	1,563,672
AZ Behavioral Health Corp.	Governor's Office of Housing Development	S+C 100	Operations and Support Services. Tenant based rental assistance in 200 scattered site units. ILS, other services to promote independence.	New	3,804,960
Mesa Community Action Network	Mesa Community Action Network	East Valley Men's Center	Operations and Support Services. Case management, living skills and outreach activities.	Renewal	224,300
Save The Family Foundation of Arizona	Save The Family Foundation of Arizona	Trans. Housing for Homeless Domestic Violence Victims	Operations and Support Services. Transitional housing for homeless, domestic violence victims. Employment training, mental health counseling, case management, legal advocacy	Renewal	211,412
Save The Family Foundation of Arizona	Save The Family Foundation of Arizona	Trans. Housing & Sup. Services for DV Victims	Operations & Support Services. Leasing costs, case management, life skills programming, counseling and childcare	Renewal	411,726
Sojourner Center	Sojourner Center	Transitional Housing & Support for DV	Operations and supportive services. Supportive intervention/counseling, case management , employment assistance, childcare		

2002 HUD McKinney Grant Applications Summary
Maricopa Continuum of Care
4-Jun-02

Project Sponsor	Applicant	Project Name	Project Description	New / Renewal	Funding Request
SW Behavioral Health	SW Behavioral Health	The Homeless Haven	Operations and Support Services. Facility repair & maintenance, utilities, food, staff, vehicle operation, insurance, security staff	Renewal	205,977
US Vets Initiative, Inc.	US Vets Initiative, Inc.	Arizona Veterans Initiative Project	Operations and Support Services. Substance abuse counseling, job development, support groups, case management	Renewal	501,597
Women in New Recovery	Women in New Recovery	WINR & Kids	Operations and Support Services. Temporary housing and support for sober female alcoholics and addicts and their children. Case management, life skills, counseling, employment services, child care, transitional living services	New	62,731
Women Living Free	Women Living Free	Transitional Housing Program	Operations and Support services. Pre and post release services for convicted female felons, therapy, life skills training, job readiness, basic needs assistance, continued support services	New	169,002

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS **INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review**

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

9-1-1 Budget Request to the Arizona Department of Administration for Equipment and Operating Funds

SUMMARY:

Each year, the Public Safety Answering Point (PSAP) Managers submit inventory and upgrade requests that are used to develop a five year equipment program that forecasts future 9-1-1 equipment needs of the region and will enable MAG to provide estimates of future funding needs to the Arizona Department of Administration (ADOA). The ADOA Order of Adoption stipulates allowable funding under the Emergency Telecommunications Services Revolving Fund.

In November 2000, the Regional Council approved the 9-1-1 Five Year System Management Plan. This plan addressed all areas of the system including administration, budget, database maintenance, equipment and growth for the region's 9-1-1 emergency telephone system. The budget request submitted for the MAG region is being made specifically to address the issues identified in the five-year plan. The Management Committee is requested to recommend approval of the funding request and the equipment program for submittal to ADOA.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: The five-year equipment program assists the MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team to forecast future equipment needs of the region and will enable MAG to provide estimates regarding future funding needs to ADOA.

CONS: None.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: None.

POLICY: The process for approval of the PSAP funding request and five-year equipment program, which includes recommendations from the MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team and Management Committee and approval by the Regional Council, demonstrates greater participation by management.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the MAG FY 2004 PSAP Funding Request and MAG FY 2004-2008 PSAP Equipment Program, and the request for 9-1-1 operating funds for submittal to the Arizona Department of Administration.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

9-1-1 Oversight Team: On May 9, 2002, the MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team recommended approval of the MAG FY 2004 PSAP Funding Request and MAG FY 2004-2008 PSAP Equipment Program, and the request for 9-1-1 operating funds for submittal to the Arizona Department of Administration.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Harry Beck, Phoenix Fire Department,
Chairman
Jim Gibson, Glendale Fire Department
Steve Werner, Maricopa County
Sheriff's Office
Ron Poulin for Dennis L. Donna, Mesa
Police Department
Mike Fusco, Emergency Management, Peoria

Tami DeRuiter for Blake McClelland,
Phoenix Police Department
Helen Gandara-Zavala, Scottsdale
Police Department
Jay Spradling for Cliff Jones,
Tempe Fire Department
*Lawrence Rodriguez, Tolleson
Police Department

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

MAG 9-1-1 PSAP Managers Group: On April 18, 2002, the MAG 9-1-1 PSAP Managers Group recommended approval of the MAG FY 2004 PSAP Funding Request and MAG FY 2004-2008 PSAP Equipment Program, and the request for 9-1-1 operating funds for submittal to the Arizona Department of Administration.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Susan MacFarlane, Chairperson
* Dan Scott, Apache Junction
Glen Hutchinson for Katie Post, Avondale
* Velma Washington, Buckeye
Patty Gambee for Richard Speer, Chandler
* Michelle Busch, El Mirage
Janet Laird, Gilbert
Sheila Pattee, Glendale
* Chris Nadeau, Goodyear
Liz Hunt for Joe Noce, Mesa
Tom Melton, Maricopa County
* Bruce Barrows, Paradise Valley
Viola Bent, Peoria
* Curtis Thomas, Salt River Pima-Maricopa
Indian Community
Ramsey Beckstead, Scottsdale

* Ken Blume, Surprise
Karen Allen, Tempe
* Jeff Walter, Tolleson
* Ronnie Miller, Wickenburg
*+Carol McLeod, ASU
+ Barbara Jaeger, ADOA
*+Fred Christley, Capitol Police
+ Debbie Henry, DPS
+ Mark Bach, Ft. McDowell
Yavapai Nation
*+Tracy Smith, Luke AFB
*+Louise Smith, Phoenix
+ Tami deRuiter, Phoenix
+ Ken Reid for Joe Gibson,
Rural Metro/Southwest Ambulance

* Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

+ Ex-Officio member

CONTACT PERSON:

Susan MacFarlane, Phoenix Fire, 602-262-4433

MAG FY2004-2008 PSAP Equipment Program

	FY2004	FY2005	FY2006	FY2007	FY2008
Apache Junction PD	No response				
ASU PD	No response				
Avondale PD	No response				
Buckeye PD	None	None	None	None	None
Capitol PD	None	None	None	None	None
Chandler PD	No response				
DPS	None	None	None	None	None
El Mirage PD	No response				
Ft. McDowell	None	None	None	None	None
Gilbert PD	None	None	None	None	None
Glendale PD	None	None	None	None	None
Goodyear PD	None	None	None	None	None
Luke AFB	No response				
MCSO	Meridian and Power Map software upgrade & relocate switch	9 Power 911 PCs, 5-18" and 5-15" flat screen monitors	Meridian, Power map and Power 911 software upgrade, 9 Power 911 PCs, 5-18" and 5-15" flat screen monitors	8-15" flat screen monitors	Meridian, Power 911 and Power Map software upgrade
Mesa PD	2 workstations	Replace 5 workstations	2 workstations	Replace 25 workstation hardware and 2 servers	Replace 5 workstations
Paradise Valley PD	None	None	None	None	None
Peoria PD	Upgrade to CTI	None	None	None	None
Phoenix Fire	8 workstations			Digital switch	
Phoenix PD	6 workstations & logging recorder	6 additional workstations	6 additional workstations	6 additional workstations	Upgrade all 911 equipment
Rural Metro PD	No response				
Salt River PD	None	None	None	None	None
Scottsdale PD	No response				
Surprise PD	None	Additional workstation		Additional workstation	
Tempe PD	4 VESTA view positions	3 additional workstations and logging recorder	8 VESTA position's hardware and server replacements	8 VESTA position's hardware and server replacements	1 additional workstation
Tolleson PD		Upgrade to CTI			
Wickenburg PD	No response				

MAG FY 2004 PSAP ANNUAL ELEMENT/FUNDING REQUEST

SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION: Maricopa County 9-1-1 (33320)
 AGENCY SUBMITTING: Phoenix Fire Department
 ADDRESS: 150 S. 12th St., Phoenix, AZ 85034

CONTACT: Susan MacFarlane
 TELEPHONE #: (602) 262-4433
 DATE: 4-Apr-02

Fiscal Year		2003					2004						
TOTAL	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	
Ringdown Circuits:													
911 Monthly Service:													
							10% increase						
\$4,800,000	\$380,000	\$380,000	\$380,000	\$380,000	\$380,000	\$380,000	\$420,000	\$420,000	\$420,000	\$420,000	\$420,000	\$420,000	
Equipment:**													
\$1,274,000	\$755,000	\$405,000			\$50,000		\$64,000						
Other: Local level network management													
\$168,200	\$51,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	\$10,600	
Maintenance:*													
\$972,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	\$81,000	
Network Installation: Phase II													
\$0													
FY TOTALS													
\$7,214,200	\$1,267,600	\$876,600	\$471,600	\$471,600	\$521,600	\$471,600	\$575,600	\$511,600	\$511,600	\$511,600	\$511,600	\$511,600	

Equipment:

MCSO	Meridian/Mapping software/relocate switch/logging recorder	\$50,000	November
Mesa PD	2 additional workstations	\$64,000	January
Peoria PD	Upgrade to CTI	\$300,000	July
Phoenix Fire Dept	8 additional workstations	\$405,000	August
Phoenix PD	6 additional workstations and logging recorder	\$275,000	July
Tempe PD*	4 Vesta View positions	\$180,000	July

Maintenance:*

Includes \$12,000 per month for Rural Metro, Mesa PD, and Phoenix Fire software maintenance

Subtotal \$1,274,000

**Equipment costs are estimates. Qwest to provide more accurate costs

Other: Local level network management

Network Manager	\$107,800	July-June	\$31,000/July and \$6,400 each month
Secretary II	\$40,000	July-June	\$10,000/July and \$2,500 each month
Contract work for Legal services and Public Information services	\$10,000	July-June	
Overtime for MSAG maintenance	\$5,000	July-June	
Travel expenses for pertinent conferences and continuing education	\$5,040	July-June	
Subtotal	<u>\$167,840</u>		

June 4, 2002

TO: Members of the MAG Management Committee

FROM: Michelle Green, Regional Development Planner

SUBJECT: DESERT SPACES IMPLEMENTATION

The Desert Spaces Plan (adopted by Regional Council 1995) is a widely accepted plan for regional open space in the MAG region. The Plan recommends conservation and management strategies for lands that were identified as critical to the quality of life in the Valley. In 1996, the Desert Spaces Implementation Task Force was formed to further implement the recommendations of the Desert Spaces Plan. One of the recommendations of this Task Force was to form a citizens committee to provide leadership to enhance the implementation of the Desert Spaces Plan. This action may no longer be appropriate as there have been many changes since the Desert Spaces plan was adopted. The purpose of this memorandum is to provide some background information and outline a process by which the Desert Spaces Plan could be updated and its implementation furthered.

Staff recommends that the Desert Spaces Implementation Task Force reconvene to:

- Update the Desert Spaces Plan in view of recent events that affect open space implementation;
- Review what member agencies have done or plan to do with respect to open space.
- Identify specific projects and determine what methods would be appropriate for conserving or preserving them, based on the up-to-date information.
- Prepare a final report to be presented at a public “Town Hall.” (Town Hall as proposed by Regional Council)

Background

The Desert Spaces Implementation Task Force, formed in 1996, was intended to be “a high level, focused group that would pool their experience and expertise to put in place a framework to assist local government in identifying opportunities for conserving or protecting environmentally sensitive development areas, and conservation areas identified in the MAG Desert Spaces Plan.” The mission of the Desert Spaces Implementation Task Force (as developed by the task force) is to “develop supportable actions to create a contiguous open space system that sets priorities and identifies processes to implement the Desert Spaces Plan.”

In 1997 the Implementation Task Force conducted a survey to determine the level of community support for implementing the Desert Spaces Plan. This survey, of 800 registered voters in Maricopa County, determined that there was exceptional support for implementing the Desert Spaces Plan. The survey also showed support for a citizens committee and an annual audit or report.

With a mandate to go forward with the implementation of the Desert Spaces Plan, in 1999, the task force prepared the Environmentally Sensitive Development Areas: Policies and Design Guidelines in 1999. This document built on the Desert Spaces Plan by providing design guidelines for development in areas that the Plan designated as retention. The Task Force then followed up with a final report in 2000, which included recommendations to further implement the Desert Spaces plan. One of those recommendations was to organize a citizens committee that would be appointed by Regional Council. The final report of the task force also included a series of goals with respect to implementing the Desert Spaces Plan.

Reconvene the Task Force

At this point, it may be premature to convene a citizens committee because the Task Force still has technical work that needs to be completed to update the plan and achieve the goals identified in its final report. It is important to keep the plan current and keep public and private partners engaged in the process. This requires

the active participation of a committee with technical expertise. It is recommended that the Task Force be reconvened, rather than creating a new one.

The people on the Task Force are familiar with the acquisition techniques, preservation tools, and local issues, making them the most appropriate people to work toward achieving the goals in its final report and in updating the Desert Spaces Plan. The results of their work would be presented in an annual report that would then be reviewed by citizens, at a Town Hall meeting. (A Town Hall meeting as proposed by Regional Council)

The Task Force addressed the retention areas through the Environmentally Sensitive Development Areas: Design Guidelines, the conservation areas still need to be addressed. The following is a description of a process for implementing the conservation goals with respect to the implementation of the Desert Spaces Plan.

Update the Desert Spaces Plan

There have been changes with respect to the number of conservation acquisitions and the available methods of acquiring open space since the Desert Spaces Plan was adopted in 1995. Some communities have acquired land on their own or have submitted applications through the Arizona Preserve Initiative (API). API is a state funded initiative that sets aside 20 million dollars annually for a period of 11 years as matching funds to purchase urban State Trust lands for conservation purposes. Communities are required to apply to the state land commissioner to have lands reclassified based on a set of criteria which are set out in the legislation.

The first step the Task Force would need to take is to update its information. They would need to review the original Desert Spaces Plan in light of new information to see what land designated as conservation has been conserved, developed or is in the process of being conserved.

Review Open Space Plans

Second, the Task Force would need to review what individual communities have done or plan to do with open space and conservation. The Growing Smarter Legislation made it mandatory for many communities to prepare an open space element as part of its general plan. The deadline for this is December 31, 2002, although this is likely to be extended by a year because of a bill making its way through the legislature now. How member agencies are dealing with open space in their own communities will have an impact on how they are dealt with regionally.

Achieving the Goals of the Task Force

The Task Force set out several goals that still need to be accomplished and may be accomplished through this proposed process. The process would involve using all of the information gathered in the first two steps to identify projects and determine specifically what methods of conserving each project would be appropriate.

Staff recommends continuing to following the guidance of the Desert Spaces plan by assigning the Task Force the responsibility for identifying specific projects, finding methods to preserve or protect them. It is expected that the Task Force would meet on a monthly basis, allowing sufficient time between meetings for work to be accomplished with MAG staff providing information and support.

Presenting to the Public

The Regional Council is seriously considering conducting Town Hall meetings to obtain feedback from citizens on a variety of issues. This would be an excellent opportunity for the Task Force to present their annual report to the public for comment.

We look forward to your recommendation to further open space implementation in the region. Attachment one contains information regarding open space implementation in the region since the adoption of the Desert Spaces Plan in 1995. Should you have any questions or require additional information please do not hesitate to contact Michelle Green, Regional Development Planner, (602) 452-5027.

Attachment One

Open Space Implementation Background

The following paragraphs describe most relevant events, affecting open space implementation, since the adoption of the MAG Desert Space in 1995.

The Arizona Preserve Initiative (API) program, which came into effect in 1998, is a program that supports the preservation of open space in and around urban areas. The Arizona Preserve Initiative allocates \$20 million a year for 11 years, to be used as matching funds for the acquisition of State Trust Lands for preservation. The land must first be identified and reclassified by the State Land Commissioner based on a set of criteria. This program has had mixed reviews at this point. One of the complaints that we hear most from member agencies is that the process of valuing the land sets the price higher than communities anticipated or can afford.

In addition to API, the Arizona Legislature passed a bill in 1998 called Growing Smarter. This law requires that communities with a population of 2,500 but less than 10,000 and whose growth rate exceeded an average of two percent per year for the ten year period before the most recent U.S. decennial census and for cities and towns having a population of 10,000 or more persons, must include an Open Space Element that includes:

- (a) A comprehensive Inventory of open space areas, recreational resources, and designations of access points to open space areas and resources.
- (b) An analysis of forecasted needs, policies for managing and protecting open space areas and resources and implementation strategies to acquire additional open space areas and further establish recreational resources.
- (c) Policies and implementation strategies designed to promote a regional system of integrated open space and recreational resources and consideration of any existing regional open space plans.

In 2000 a committee came together to produce the Valley Vision 2025 report. While this report did not specifically address open space, it did include a Natural Features and Open Space Subcommittee report. Many of the recommendations of this subcommittee validated the recommendations of the Desert Spaces Implementation Task Force. The report found that preservation ranked 3rd among all regional issues by the Valley Vision 2025 Committee.

Last year, there were two initiatives on the ballot related to open space and conservation, these are the Citizens Growth Management Initiative that recommended using growth boundaries to confine growth, among other things, the second was an initiative that proposed setting aside 3% (Prop 100) of State Trust Land as open space based on certain criteria. Both of these propositions failed. There are a variety of opinions as to why they failed, most commonly people say that the Growth Management Initiative went too far and that 3% of State Trust Land was not enough. This indicates that open space, as most people would agree, is an important issue to Arizonans.

The failure of Prop 100 resulted in a group of interested parties coming together on a committee to cooperate on implementing changes in the way the State Land Department operates to allow for the conservation of some State Trust Land. This cooperation is an alternative to several groups going forward with ballot initiatives and investing money in efforts that contradict one another. These parties include but are not limited to, the State Land Department, the conservation community, the education community who are the main beneficiaries of State Trust Land, the development community represented by the Homebuilders Association, Valley Partnership, land use attorneys, cities in Maricopa County, represented by MAG. There are other participants, and groups informed about the process; however, the list above represents the groups that have been participating in meetings on a weekly basis.

The purpose of the meetings is to discuss alternatives for developing a process for determining what portion of State Trust Land could be preserved and how it could be preserved. This will likely involve legislative changes that would affect how the State Land Department deals with open space. Urban land and rural land are being considered differently. Clearly, the issues each of these are different therefore require a different approach.

The current concept for urban lands is that of “envelopes.” Criteria would be applied to urban lands to identify those most suitable for conservation. Those lands would then go into an “envelope.” Lands within this envelope would then be considered differently from those outside it. Within the envelope the goal of the State Land Department would be a dual one, to retain the most value for the trust while conserving as much land as possible as open space. This would be determined at the time of disposition, when the State Land Department determines that the land is ready for auction. The goal for the group is to have an initiative on the ballot in 2004.

Cities and towns are expressing more interest in open space as they realize the economic impact it can have on quality of life. The new economy is a technology-based economy, which relies heavily on highly educated employees. These people are demanding a higher quality of life, which includes access to preserved open space.

Currently, the MAG Desert Spaces plan and the Environmentally Sensitive Design Guidelines are used in our review of General Plans. We provide an analysis of how the Desert Spaces Plan applies to each community. We encourage member agencies to be cognizant of the Plan and to take action where possible.

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Requested Change to the MAG Regional Freeway Program

SUMMARY:

The Arizona Department of Transportation has requested a number of material changes to the MAG Regional Freeway Program. The changes are listed in the attachment and include schedule, cost, and new projects. Eight schedule changes are requested to better coordinate with related projects. For example, landscaping along a portion of the Pima Freeway is being delayed until the Salt River Maricopa Indian Community can provide the water source. Seven of the changes involve material cost changes which are defined as increases of more than five percent. The cost changes reflect the latest cost information available. There are five new projects being added. One is related to the cost of a drainage siphon under a section of the Pima Freeway and two others are related to systemwide management costs.

Two of the new projects are needed for required additional noise mitigation along portions of the Pima and Price Freeways. The estimated cost of the proposed FY 2003 project is \$2.78 million and \$2.9 million, respectively. According to the ADOT Noise Attenuation Policy, reasonable noise mitigation measures must be pursued if noise levels exceed 65 dB levels along highways for which development occurred prior to the date of public knowledge for the new highway. Since the Pima and Price Freeways have opened, ADOT has conducted noise studies to determine the actual noise levels in neighborhoods adjacent to the freeways. Based on these noise studies, and given development had occurred prior to the date of public knowledge, ADOT has determined additional noise mitigation is needed.

A review of the net impact of these changes indicate that the cash balances for the MAG Regional Freeway Program are adequate to accommodate the requested changes.

PUBLIC INPUT:

No public input has been received concerning the specific requested changes.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: ADOT monitors the costs and revenues for the Regional Freeway Program on a regular basis and recommends changes to schedules, scopes and budgets as needed. The ADOT Noise Attenuation Policy provides guidance to ADOT when noise reduction measures are required to mitigate the noise impacts of highway construction on neighborhoods.

CONS: The cash balances for the MAG Regional Freeway Program are low for the remainder of the program. Additional projects and/or costs will reduce these balance further which will limit the ability to accommodate other program changes.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: None

POLICY: Life cycle program management is a key element to ensure that the freeway program stays on budget and schedule. Noise mitigation measures are an important element to mitigate the impacts of freeways on developments that were underway or completed at the time the freeway alignment was determined and approved.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approval of the requested change to add the two noise mitigation projects for the Pima and Price Freeways and approval of the remainder of the changes as requested by ADOT.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

None.

CONTACT PERSON:

Eric J. Anderson, (602) 452-5008.

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TENTATIVE MAG LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM**

			Fiscal Year		Budget (000)			Schedule (Ad Date)				
Route	Phase	Project	From	To	From	To	Change	From	To	Change	Other Misc. Changes (Comments)	Type of Material Change
PIMA CORRIDOR												
101	LC	SRPMIC Boundary - Arizona Canal, LCON	03	04				Nov-02	Nov-03		Community still working to provide water to the project	Fiscal year change
101	LC	Arizona Canal - Camelback Rd, LCON	03	04				Nov-02	Nov-03		Community still working to provide water to the project	Fiscal year change
101	RD	Pima Road Extension	02	04				Jul-01	Apr-04		To provide better coordination with SRPMIC plan	Fiscal year change
101	RC	Pima Road Extension	03	05				Dec-02	Dec-04		To provide better coordination with SRPMIC plan	Fiscal year change
101	RC	Arizona Canal - McKellips Rd, Irrigation Siphon, IGA	None	03	\$0	\$500	\$500	None	Jul-02		Upfront fee for the maintenance in lieu of paying annual maintenance cost	New Project
101	WC	Pima Corridor, Noise wall Additions	None	03	\$0	\$2,780	\$2,780	None	Aug-02		To provide noise mitigation based on latest noise study	New Project
PRICE CORRIDOR												
101	WC	Price Corridor, Noise wall Additions	None	03	\$0	\$2,900	\$2,900	None	Aug-02		To provide noise mitigation based on latest noise study	New Project
RED MOUNTAIN CORRIDOR												
202	RD	Power Rd - University Dr	03	04			\$0	Dec-02	Dec-03		To match new completion date due to swapped priorities	Fiscal year change
202	RW	Power Rd - University Dr			\$9,814	\$10,381	\$567				Based on latest cost estimates	Cost change
202	RC	Power Rd - University Dr						Jan-05	Jun-05		To match new completion date due to swapped priorities	Fiscal year change
202	RD	University Dr - Southern Ave	04	03				Jan-04	May-03		To provide better coordination with adjacent design project	Fiscal year change
202	RD	US60/202 TI, Phase II	04	03			\$0	Jan-04	Jan-03		To provide better coordination with adjacent design project	Fiscal year change
SANTAN CORRIDOR												
202	RW	Power Rd - Elliot Rd			\$22,750	\$23,815	\$1,065				Based on latest cost estimates	Cost change
202	RW	Williams Field Rd - Higley Rd			\$14,155	\$9,734	(\$4,421)				Based on latest cost estimates	Cost change
202	RC	I-10 / Maricopa Road TI			\$13,294	\$14,355	\$1,061				Cost update based on latest estimates	Cost change
SKY HARBOR												
153	RW	Superior Ave - University Dr			\$4,043	\$3,533	(\$510)				Based on latest estimates	Cost change

**ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE TENTATIVE MAG LIFE CYCLE PROGRAM**

			Fiscal Year		Budget (000)			Schedule (Ad Date)				
												Type of Material Change
Route	Phase	Project	From	To	From	To	Change	From	To	Change	Other Misc. Changes (Comments)	
STATE ROUTE 51												
51	LC	Bell Rd - Pima 101L			\$2,458	\$3,300	\$842				Need to include 404 permit landscape requirements. Also, applied \$/acre landscape	Cost change
SYSTEM WIDE												
SW		Prel Eng GC (FY 04)			\$900	\$2,300	\$1,400				Cost update based on latest estimates	Cost change
SW		Design Change Orders (FY03)			\$2,500	\$3,000	\$500				Cost update based on latest estimates	Cost change
SW		Risk Management Indemnification (FY 03)	None	03	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	None	Jul-02		Arizona Revised Statutes requires that all ADOT construction and design projects have to be indemnified by the law.	New Project
SW		Right of Way Plans and Titles (FY 03)	None	03	\$0	\$1,000	\$1,000	None	Jul-02		Provides for R/W surveys, plans preparation and title reports.	New Project

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS

INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Federal Fiscal Year 2002 MAG Federal Funds Interim Closeout and Amendment/Adjustments to the FY 2002-2006 and Draft 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program and FY 2002 and FY 2003 Unified Planning Work Programs and Annual Budgets

SUMMARY:

Annual sub-allocations of Federal Obligation Authority (OA) to the MAG region must be used or they could be lost. Each year, the process to close out the MAG federally funded program is completed in three distinct steps. First, an assessment is completed to establish the precise amount of federal funds that have been sub-allocated to the MAG region and is compared with the list of projects programmed in the current year (FY 2002) of the most recent Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). Second, by March 1 of each year, MAG agencies request the deferral from the current fiscal year (FY 2002) to the following (FY 2003), of any projects that are not likely to be completed through the federal development process in time. Third, projects are identified that are able to utilize the funds available from the first two phases and from any redistributed OA that might be made available from federal sources. In this phase of the closeout process, approximately \$11.3 million is available for the close out. Approximately \$16 million in project requests have been received for the funds available. On April 23, 2002, the Transportation Review Committee (TRC) recommended approval of the deferral of the ten projects requested and, on May 21, 2002, recommended deferral of another project and recommended three projects to utilize the majority of the funds available.

PUBLIC INPUT:

The results of the early and mid phase public input meetings for the TIP were presented in the Early and Mid Phase Reports. Continuous opportunities for public input on the MAG federally funded program are also available.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: Approval of these recommendations will allow for additional and accelerated transportation projects to be funded in the MAG region. If all MAG federal funds are obligated on time, redistributed OA may become available.

CONS: If the OA is not used by September 30, 2002, the region may not receive any redistributed OA and may lose the OA that is currently available.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: Action to close out the FFY 2002 MAG federally funded program is needed to ensure that all MAG federal funds are fully used in a timely and equitable manner.

POLICY: Previously adopted MAG policies on the allocation of uncommitted and redistributed federal funds to projects have been followed.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommend approving the interim closeout of Federal FY 2002, as recommended by the Transportation Review Committee at their April 23, 2002 and May 21, 2002, meetings as follows: (1) defer the projects listed in Table One; (2) advance the projects listed in Table Two; (3) Amend the FY 2002 and FY 2003 MAG Unified Planning Work Programs and Annual Budgets to include the additional funds for the Grand Avenue Major Investment Study as shown in Table Three; and (4) Authorize an amendment to the FY 2002-2006 MAG Transportation Improvement Program to include the necessary projects in FY 2002 and an adjustment to the Draft FY 2003-2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Program as listed in Table Four.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

Transportation Review Committee: On May 21, 2002, the TRC recommended, by a vote of sixteen yes and one no (*italics*), the following actions with regard to the FFY 2002 Interim Close Out:

1. Add one Goodyear project (\$80,000, CMAQ) to the deferred list;
2. Utilize the funds available to: (a) advance a \$2,500,000 CMAQ light rail design funded project from FY 2005 and \$6,000,000 from FY 2006; (b) advance a \$480,000 Glendale STP-MAG Major Investment Study from FY 2007; and (c) advance \$475,000 from a Peoria CMAQ Traffic Signal Project from FY 2004;
3. Reserve the remaining funds for FY 2002.

These actions leave approximately \$1.85 million yet to utilize, although previous Regional Council action has allocated \$1,500,000 for the Special Census. Additional recommendations will be forthcoming regarding any further funds that may be received during the remainder of the year, including any redistributed OA that may be received.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair
Phoenix: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair
ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: David Fitzhugh
*Buckeye: Joe Blanton
Chandler: Patrice Kraus
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell
*Gila Bend: Shane Dille
Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Terry Johnson for Jim Book
Goodyear: Jerene Watson for Grant Anderson

*Guadalupe: Freddy Arteaga
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Ron Krosting
*Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Peoria: David Moody
RPTA: Bryan Jungwirth for Ken Driggs
Scottsdale: Michelle Korf
Surprise: Miryam Gutier
Tempe: Mary O'Connor

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Pat McDermott, Chandler
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix
*ITS Committee: Jim Book, Glendale

Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton, Maricopa County Dept of Transportation
Telecommunications Advisory Group: Jim Hull, Mesa

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

Transportation Review Committee: On April 23, 2002, the TRC unanimously recommended the deferral of ten projects from FY 2002 to FY 2003 and one project from FY 2002 to FY 2004. The TRC deferred action on which projects to recommend to utilize the available funding until the following month's meeting.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Wickenburg: Fred Carpenter, Chair
Phoenix: Jack Tevlin, Vice-Chair
ADOT: Dan Lance
Avondale: David Fitzhugh
Buckeye: Joe Blanton
Chandler: Patrice Kraus
Fountain Hills: Randy Harrell
*Gila Bend: Shane Dille
Gilbert: Tami Ryall
Glendale: Jim Book
Goodyear: Grant Anderson

Guadalupe: Freddy Arteaga for Mark Johnson
Litchfield Park: Mike Cartsonis
Maricopa County: Chris Plumb for Tom Buick
Mesa: Jeff Martin for Ron Krosting
Paradise Valley: Robert M. Cicarelli
Peoria: David Moody
RPTA: Ken Driggs
Scottsdale: Michelle Korf
Surprise: Miryam Gutier
Tempe: Mary O'Connor

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING

*Regional Bicycle Task Force: Pat McDermott,
Chandler
*Street Committee: Don Herp, Phoenix
ITS Committee: Jim Book, Glendale

Pedestrian Working Group: Reed Kempton,
Maricopa County Dept of Transportation
*Telecommunications Advisory Group:
Jim Hull, Mesa

* Members neither present nor represented by proxy.

CONTACT PERSON:

Paul Ward, (602) 254-6300.

Table One - FY 2002 MAG Federal Funds Available, including requests for deferral from FY 2002 to later years

Project #	Agency	Project	Funding	Fed Funds	To
Amount of carry over obligation authority from FY 2001				\$187,961	
Amount of CMAQ funds available from FY 2002 initial closeout process (under-programmed)			CMAQ	\$2,200,000	
Amount of STP-MAG funds available from FY 2002 initial closeout process (under-programmed)			STP	\$992,756	
Amount of funds available from FY 2002 deleted projects			CMAQ	\$1,552,300	
Total of funds available from FY 2002 under-programmed funds (STP-MAG and CMAQ)			All	\$4,933,017	
List of projects recommended by the TRC for deferral from FY 2002 to FY 2003 or 2004					
CHN02-012	Chandler	Consolidated Canal: Ryan Rd to Riggs Rd; construct multi-use path	CMAQ	\$707,250	2003
GLB01-002R	Gilbert	Consolidated Canal (Heritage Trl): Warner to Freestone Pk; construct multi-use path	CMAQ	\$377,800	2003
GLN01-001	Glendale	Bell Rd: 51st Ave to 83rd Ave; install computerized signal system (Phase 2)	CMAQ	\$665,000	2003
GDY01-101C	Goodyear	Rainbow Valley Rd: Riggs Rd to Hunt Hwy; pave dirt road (phase I)	CMAQ	\$80,000	2003
MES02-006	Mesa	Consolidated Canal: Lindsay Rd to Baseline Rd; construct multi-use path	CMAQ	\$447,925	2003
MES01-917R	Mesa	Stapley Dr: Baseline Rd to McKellips Rd; Install traffic control signal system	CMAQ	\$339,480	2003
PEO02-003	Peoria	83rd Ave at Thunderbird Rd; construct additional turn lanes	CMAQ	\$565,800	2003
PEO02-005	Peoria	New River Rd: Northern Ave to Peoria Ave; construct multi-use path	CMAQ	\$440,722	2003
PHX01-014RW	Phoenix	Maryland Ave at I-17; acquire ROW for bicycle overpass	CMAQ	\$943,000	2003
PHX02-105	Phoenix	Various locations: pave dirt shoulders (phase 1)	CMAQ	\$830,000	2003
TMP02-006	Tempe	Rio Salado Pkwy: Mill Ave to Priest Ave; construct multi-use path on south bank	CMAQ	\$943,000	2004
Total amount of MAG Federally funded projects requested for deferral from 2002 to later years			CMAQ	\$6,339,977	
Total amount of ALL MAG Federal funds available during the Interim FY 2002 closeout process			All	\$11,272,994	

Table Two - Projects recommended to utilize the available MAG FFY 2002 Closeout Funding

Project #	Agency	Project	Fund Type	Federal Funds	From Year
GLN07-314	Glendale	US-60 (Grand Ave): I-17 to Agua Fria Fwy; MIS Phase II	STP	\$480,000	2007
PEO04-103	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$475,000	2004
New	RPTA	Regionwide - Additional funding for Light Rail Transit projects	CMAQ	\$8,500,000	2005/6
New	MAG	Regionwide: Support funding for Special Census	STP	\$1,500,000	New
Total of projects recommended to utilize the available MAG FFY 2002 Closeout Funding				\$10,955,000	

Table Three: Changes required to the FY 2002 and FY 2003 MAG Unified Planning Work Programs (UPWP)

Description	Year	Action required
MAG: Regional; Add a new Major Investment Study (Phase II) on US-60 (Grand Ave): I-17 to Agua Fria Fwy	2002	Add new project to FY 2002 UPWP
MAG: Regional; Add a new Major Investment Study (Phase II) on US-60 (Grand Ave): I-17 to Agua Fria Fwy	2003	Carry over funds from FY 2002 to FY 2003 UPWP

Table Four - Amendment/Adjustments to the FY 2002-2006 and Draft FY 2003–2007 MAG Transportation Improvement Programs

Proj #	Agency	Description	Funding	Local	Federal	Total	Action
RPT02-327T	RPTA	Regionwide: Regional light rail - design	CMAQ	\$515,000	\$8,500,000	\$9,015,000	Add new project to FY 2002 (replaces RPT05-206T and RPT06-224T)
RPT05-206T	RPTA	Regionwide: Regional light rail - final design, right of way and construction	CMAQ	\$152,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,652,000	Delete project from 2005
RPT06-224T	RPTA	Regionwide: Regional light rail - final design, right of way and construction	CMAQ	\$393,000	\$6,500,000	\$6,893,000	Delete project from 2006
RPT06-224TR	RPTA	Regionwide: Regional light rail - final design, right of way and construction	CMAQ	\$30,225	\$500,000	\$530,225	Add new project in FY 2006 (replaces RPT06-224T)
GLN07-314	Glendale	US-60 (Grand Ave): I-17 to Agua Fria Fwy; MIS Phase II	STP-MAG	\$29,100	\$480,000	\$509,100	Add new project to FY 2002
PEO02-004	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$57,000	\$943,000	\$1,000,000	Delete project from FY 2002
PEO02-004R	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$86,000	\$1,418,000	\$1,504,000	Add new project in FY 2002 (replaces PEO02-004)
PEO04-103	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$57,000	\$943,000	\$1,000,000	Delete project from FY 2004
PEO04-103R	Peoria	Citywide; Interconnect traffic signal system	CMAQ	\$28,289	\$468,000	\$496,289	Add new project in FY 2004 (replaces PEO04-103)
MAG02-312	MAG	Regionwide: Set-a-side funding for Special Census	STP-MAG	\$0	\$1,500,000	\$1,500,000	Add new project to FY 2002

MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS INFORMATION SUMMARY... for your review

DATE:

June 4, 2002

SUBJECT:

Arizona Department of Environmental Quality Request for Offer for a Community Emergency Notification System

SUMMARY:

In October 2000, MAG was notified that funding may be available for emergency warning system to provide emergency agencies with the ability to notify citizens within an event area of floods, fires, chemical spills, industrial mishaps, evacuations, or other emergencies has been identified. This funding was being made available from a court settlement through the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), Hazardous Waste Section. On October 19, 2000, the MAG 9-1-1 Oversight Team recommended accepting the funding.

Since that time, ADEQ indicated that a procurement process would be used to determine which agency would implement the system. On April 12, 2002, ADEQ released a Request for Offer (RFO) for a Community Emergency Notification System (CENS). The RFO had a definitive amount of funds, \$2.5 million, and wanted a system in place for a minimum of two years. The RFO specifically asked how a responder would continue to fund the system after depletion of the funds. MAG responded to the request through the 911 Office. The 911 Office collaborated with Qwest to provide a comprehensive response. The 911 Office will be responsible for the management of the system including the initial design, testing, implementation, training, public awareness and ongoing maintenance of the system. Qwest is providing their Emergency Preparedness Network (EPN) product that is able to make up to 2,200 notification calls in a 60 second period. Qwest utilizes the 911 database that contains all telephone records including non-published and unlisted numbers as the source for making the calls. The data used for EPN is as secure as the 911 database and the information is only available for public safety use.

The MAG proposal identified the ability to keep the system operational for three years before depletion of the \$2.5 million. Identified annual recurring costs of the system include \$609,000 for maintenance and the salary of a program manager to handle the ongoing management of the system. MAG identified three initial avenues to explore for sustaining the system. These recommendations included raising the 911 assessment for participating agencies, charging a per call fee for agencies activating the system for non-life threatening situations, such as sex offender notification, and seeking funding from the State 911 fund. All of these options will be explored if MAG is successful in their response. The RFO closed on May 24, 2002 and the ADEQ anticipates awarding the RFO in six weeks.

PUBLIC INPUT:

None.

PROS & CONS:

PROS: An emergency warning system would provide emergency agencies with the ability to notify citizens within an event area of floods, fires, chemical spills, industrial mishaps, evacuations, or other emergencies.

CONS: Funding for continued maintenance and the salary of a program manager to handle the ongoing management of the system is needed.

TECHNICAL & POLICY IMPLICATIONS:

TECHNICAL: None.

POLICY: In establishing the MAG 9-1-1 system, the MAG member agencies, through resolution of their governing bodies, authorized the City of Phoenix to serve as the contract agent for 9-1-1 service. The Community Emergency Notification System is an extension of the 9-1-1 service, which has already been authorized by the MAG member agencies.

ACTION NEEDED:

Recommendation to receive the Community Emergency Notification System funding, if awarded from the Arizona Department of Environmental Quality, and to amend the FY 2003 MAG Unified Planning Work Program and Annual Budget to reflect acceptance of the funding and program.

PRIOR COMMITTEE ACTIONS:

MAG 911 Oversight Team: On October 19, 2000, the Oversight Team recommended accepting the funds from the ADEQ and responsibility for the design, development, management, and implementation of the system, with MAG as the accounting entity pending the settlement funds becoming available.

MEMBERS ATTENDING

Harry Beck, Phoenix Fire Department,
Chairman
*Jim Gibson, Glendale Fire Department
Shelly Bunn, Maricopa County Sheriff's Office
Dennis L. Donna, Mesa Police Department
Mike Fusco, Peoria Emergency Management

*Dave Bennett, Phoenix Police Department
Dave Jones for Helen Gandara-Zavala,
Scottsdale Police Dept.
*Cliff Jones, Tempe Fire Department
*Lawrence Rodriguez, Tolleson Police Dept.

*Those members neither present nor represented by proxy.

CONTACT PERSON:

Susan MacFarlane, Phoenix Fire, 602-262-4433.

BY-LAWS
OF
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS
ARTICLE I
STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES AND POLICIES

Section 1:

The underlying concept of the Maricopa Association of Governments is that cities, towns, counties and Indian communities, which are closest to the people, should exercise the basic initiative and leadership and that they should have the primary responsibility for treating with those local problems and needs which require action on an area-wide or regional basis.

Section 2:

The area of concern for the Maricopa Association of Governments is defined as those issues or projects which ~~effect~~ AFFECT all or a significant part of Maricopa County AND THE URBANIZED AREAS CONTIGUOUS TO MARICOPA COUNTY.

Section 3:

Constructive and workable policies and programs for meeting area-wide problems of local government will be most effectively and expeditiously developed by regular meetings of governmental unit members in an area-wide voluntary and cooperative association dedicated to the solution of these problems.

Section 4:

Nothing contained in these By-Laws shall authorize the Maricopa Association of Governments to intervene in matters which are essentially within the jurisdiction of any one (1) member, nor to intervene in matters which may affect more than one (1) member but are effective only within each jurisdiction.

Section 5:

The Maricopa Association of Governments is not, nor is it intended to be, a substitute for local government. It is, however, an organization through which individual governmental units can work on regional problems and coordinate their efforts.

ARTICLE II
DEFINITIONS

Section 1:

Association. Association, as used in these By-Laws, means the Maricopa Association of Governments, a nonprofit corporation of the State of Arizona created pursuant to Title 10, Arizona Revised Statutes.

Section 2:

Regional Council. Regional Council, as used in these By-Laws, means the membership of this corporation. The number and qualifications of members is set forth in Article III of these By-Laws. The Regional Council is also constituted as the Board of Directors of this corporation.

Section 3:

Executive Committee. Executive Committee, as used in these By-Laws, means the Chair, Vice Chair and Treasurer of the Regional Council in addition to any other member selected by the Regional Council to serve on the Executive Committee.

Section 4:

Management Committee. Management Committee, as used in these By-Laws, means the eligible city or town managers, or city or town clerks of incorporated municipalities which do not have the council-manager form of government; the county manager of Maricopa County; the chief administrative officer of an Indian community; and the Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Executive Director of the Regional PUBLIC Transportation Authority who shall serve as ex-officio members of the Management Committee for traffic and transportation matters only.

Section 5:

Standing and Special Committees. Standing Committee, as used in these By-laws, means the permanent committee(s) formed by the Regional Council to conduct studies and projects on a continuing basis. Special Committee, as used in these By-Laws, means the committee(s) formed by the Regional Council on a temporary basis for the completion of special studies and projects.

ARTICLE III
MEMBERSHIP

Section 1:

A person shall not be eligible to be a member of this corporation unless he or she is a duly elected member of a governing body of a unit of local government located in Maricopa County OR IN AN URBANIZED AREA CONTIGUOUS TO MARICOPA COUNTY, except that the two Arizona Department of Transportation board members for District I shall have ex-officio membership in the corporation for traffic and transportation matters only and the Chairman of the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee shall have ex-officio membership in the corporation for matters relating to the regional freeway system only. For the purposes of this section, a unit of local government is defined as a city, ~~or~~ town OR INDIAN COMMUNITY located in Maricopa County, that portion of an Indian Community located in Maricopa County OR IN AN URBANIZED AREA CONTIGUOUS TO MARICOPA COUNTY, and the County of Maricopa. The unit of local government shall designate the person among its duly elected governing body that shall serve as a member of the corporation. Not more than (1) member of the governing body may represent any unit of local government at any time. The government of the corporation shall be vested in the membership and shall be collectively known as the "Regional Council."

Section 2:

A certificate of membership shall be issued to each member, which certificate shall not be transferable. Any person ceasing to be a member, whether voluntarily or by expulsion or no longer meeting the eligibility requirements established by Section 1 of this Article, shall forfeit all rights and privileges of membership and all rights and claims in and to the property of the corporation, and all his or her, its or their interests in such property shall vest in the corporation, absolutely. Each certificate of membership shall express on its face that it shall not be ~~transferable~~ TRANSFERABLE.

Section 3:

The membership of the Maricopa Association of Governments can be increased by a majority vote of the members.

ARTICLE IV
MEETINGS OF MEMBERS

Section 1:

The annual meeting of the members of Maricopa Association of Governments shall be held on the fourth Wednesday in June of each year in Phoenix, Maricopa County, Arizona, at a time and place to be designated in the notice of the meeting.

Section 2:

Regular meetings of the members may be held in Maricopa County, Arizona, with the time, date and location of said meetings to be determined by the Regional Council.

Section 3:

Special meetings of the Regional Council may be held in Maricopa County, Arizona, whenever called in writing by the Chair or Vice Chair. In the absence of the Chair, any six (6) members of the corporation may call said meetings. The place of holding special meetings shall be designated in the notice.

Section 4:

The calls and notices of all meetings of the members shall conform to the provisions of Article V of these By-Laws.

Section 5:

The Chair, and in his or her absence the Vice Chair, shall preside at such meetings.

Section 6:

Each member of the corporation, excepting the Arizona Department of Transportation board members for District I, and the Chairman of the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee is entitled to vote on all matters coming before any meeting of its membership, and each member of the corporation, including the Chair, Vice Chair and Treasurer of the Regional Council may be represented in vote by proxy. The Secretary shall enter a record of such proxies in the minutes of the meetings. On traffic and transportation matters, the District I transportation board members for the Arizona Department of Transportation shall each have one vote. On matters relating to the regional freeway system, the Chairman of the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee shall have only one vote.

Section 7:

A simple majority in number of the members, either in person or by proxy, shall constitute a quorum for all purposes. In the absence of a quorum, the Chair of the meeting may adjourn the meeting from time to time without notice, other than by announcement at the meeting, until members sufficient to constitute a quorum shall attend, either in person, or by proxy. At the adjourned meeting at which a quorum shall be present any business may be transacted which might have been transacted at the meeting as originally notified.

Section 8:

All information and/or irregularities in calls, notices of meeting and in the manner of voting, form of proxy credentials, method of ascertaining those present shall be deemed waived if no objection is made at the meeting.

Section 9:

The Regional Council may adopt rules governing its procedures.

ARTICLE V

**NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR
MEETINGS OF REGIONAL COUNCIL**

Section 1:

Whenever all of the members shall meet in person or by proxy, such meeting shall be valid for all purposes without call or notice and at such meeting any corporate action may be taken. Whenever all of the Regional Council members meet, such meeting shall be valid for all purposes without call or notices. No call or notice of any meeting of the members shall be necessary if waiver of call and notice be signed by all of the members.

Section 2:

At least five (5) days before the day of any meeting of the members, the Secretary, when requested by the Chair, or in his or her absence by the Vice Chair; or a majority of the Regional Council, shall cause a written notice setting forth the time, place and general purpose of the meeting to be delivered personally or by mail with postage prepaid to each member of record at his or her last post office address as it appears on the books of the corporation.

Section 3:

Any meeting of the Regional Council sitting as a Board of Directors may be called by the Chair or in his or her absence, the Vice Chair, or by a majority of the Regional Council, and notice of such meetings shall be given by the Secretary at least twenty-four (24) hours before the time fixed for the meeting and such notice shall specify time, place and general purpose of the meeting and shall be delivered personally or mailed, postage prepaid, to each member at his or her last post office address as it appears on the books of the corporation, or shall be communicated to the member by telephone.

ARTICLE VI
**MEETINGS OF COMMITTEES
NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS**

Section 1:

The Management Committee shall meet on the call of its Chair with the date, time and place to be fixed by the Chair. At least two (2) days prior notice shall be given to Committee members and the Secretary.

Section 2:

Standing and Special Committees shall meet on the call of their Chair with notification to the Committee members and to the Secretary two (2) days prior to meeting of said Standing or Special Committees.

ARTICLE VII
REGIONAL COUNCIL SITTING AS A BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Section 1:

The business and affairs of the corporation shall be conducted by the Regional Council sitting as a Board of Directors at properly called meetings.

Section 2:

In case the office of Chair, Vice Chair or Treasurer becomes vacant, the remaining Regional Council members, by affirmative vote of the majority thereof, shall elect a successor to hold office for the unexpired term of the officer whose position shall be vacant.

Section 3:

Each director is entitled to vote on all matters coming before any meeting of Regional Council, and each director may be represented in vote by proxy. The Secretary shall enter a record of such proxies in the minutes of the meeting.

Section 4:

The powers and functions of the Regional Council subject to the limitations hereinafter stated, shall include, but not be limited to, the following:

- a. The formulating of policy decisions and determination of policy matters for the corporation.
- b. The approval and adoption of a budget for each fiscal year and a service charge schedule.

c.The initiation and/or request for studies to be undertaken either by inter-agency agreement, contract, or otherwise as they may deem appropriate.

d.The right of any director at any meeting of the Regional Council to propose a subject for study by the Maricopa Association of Governments.

e.The right of any director at any meeting of the Regional Council to request review of any action taken by the Management Committee during the interval between meetings of the Regional Council.

f

The appointment of such Standing and Special committees deemed necessary to achieve the purposes of the Association. The Regional Council may delegate its appointment authority for Standing and Special committee members to the Chair of the Regional Council.

Section 5:

No person shall have the authority to make or execute binding contracts on behalf of the Maricopa Association of Governments except upon approval of the Regional Council or Executive Committee acting at a properly called meeting. Any contract made or executed by the Executive Committee shall be subject to ratification by the Regional Council at its next meeting.

ARTICLE VIII

OFFICERS

Section 1:

At the annual meeting the members shall elect the following officers of the corporation: Chair, Vice Chair, and Treasurer, each of whom shall, when elected, also serve as a member of the Executive Committee of this corporation.

Section 2:

The Chair shall be the chief executive of the corporation and shall exercise general supervision over its affairs. He or she shall sign on behalf of the corporation all documents requiring the signature of the corporation and shall do and perform all other acts and things which the Regional Council may require of him or her. He or she shall serve without compensation.

Section 3:

In the absence of the Chair, or his or her inability to act or serve, the Vice Chair shall have the powers of the Chair. He or she shall perform such further duties as the Regional Council may delegate to him or her and shall receive no compensation for his or her services.

Section 4:

The Treasurer shall have the custody and control of the funds of the corporation, subject to the acts of the Regional Council, and shall report the state of the finances of the corporation at each annual meeting of the members and at any special meeting of the members when requested by the Chair. He or she shall perform such other services as the Regional Council may require of him or her and shall serve without compensation.

Section 5:

The Secretary shall be appointed by and serve at the pleasure of the Regional Council and shall keep the minutes of the corporation and such books and these By-Laws or resolutions of the Regional Council may require him or her to keep. He or she shall attest the signature of the authorized officer of all documents requiring the signature of the corporation, shall be the custodian of the seal of the corporation and shall affix the seal to all papers and instruments requiring it. He or she shall perform such other services as the Regional Council may require of him or her and shall receive such compensation for his or her services as the Regional Council may allow. The Secretary shall not be a member of this corporation.

ARTICLE IX

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Section 1:

At the annual meeting of the Regional Council, the Regional Council shall elect an Executive Committee of not less than three (3) Regional Council members to serve until the next annual meeting of the Regional Council. The Chair, Vice Chair and Treasurer of the Regional Council shall be ex-officio members of the Executive Committee, and the Chair shall serve as Chair of the Executive Committee.

Section 2:

In case of any vacancy in the Executive Committee, the Regional Council at its next meeting, may elect a successor to the Committee in the same manner as provided for in Article VII, Section 2, of these By-Laws.

Section 3:

The business and affairs of the corporation which arise between meetings of the Regional Council shall be conducted by the Executive Committee.

Section 4:

The Executive Committee shall meet at the call of the Chair at such place designated by him or her and special meetings may be called by any member of the Committee by having the Secretary give written notice thereof to all of the other members.

Section 5:

A majority of the members of the Executive Committee shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of business at any meeting of the Executive Committee.

Section 6:

The Secretary shall take minutes at all meetings of the Executive Committee and copies of said minutes shall be furnished to the members of the Regional Council after approval by the Executive Committee.

ARTICLE X

MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Section 1:

There is established a Management Committee of the Maricopa Association of Governments which shall consist of the eligible city or town managers, or city or town clerks of incorporated municipalities which do not have the council-manager form of government; the county manager of Maricopa County; and the chief administrative officer of the Indian communities. The Director of the Arizona Department of Transportation and the Executive Director of the Regional Public Transportation Authority shall serve in an ex-officio capacity only when matters of traffic and transportation are before the Management Committee. In such matters the Arizona Department of Transportation Director and the Executive Director of the Regional Public Transportation Authority shall each have one vote.

Section 2:

The Management Committee shall be responsible for the functions as hereinafter set forth:

a. There shall be selected a Chair and Vice Chair, from the members of the Management Committee. Said selection shall occur at the first meeting in June of each year. In the event a vacancy occurs in the chairmanship, the Vice Chair shall become the Chair for the unexpired term and a Vice Chair shall be elected to complete the remainder of the Vice Chair's term.

b. The Management Committee shall have the authority to appoint committees and personnel to study specific problems, programs, or other matters which the Management Committee has approved for study.

c. The Management Committee shall act as the coordinating agency for all other committees and subsidiary groups.

d
The Management Committee shall keep the Regional Council informed on any matter or problem involving intergovernmental cooperation.

e
The Management Committee shall perform any other functions assigned by the Regional Council.

ARTICLE XI

STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

Section 1:

Standing and Special Committees shall be created by the Regional Council from time to time, as the Regional Council may deem appropriate.

Section 2:

The Regional Council shall authorize and define the powers and duties of all committees of the Council.

Section 3:

The Regional Council shall designate a Chair and Vice Chair of the Standing and Special Committees. Vacancies occurring in these positions shall be filled by the Regional Council unless such authority has been delegated to the Chair of the Regional Council.

Section 4:

Membership on Standing and Special Committees shall be determined by the Regional Council. There shall be no minimum nor maximum number of members on any Standing or Special Committee. Nothing in these By-Laws shall be construed to limit membership on these aforesaid committees exclusively to officials serving political subdivisions of the State. The Regional Council, in its discretion, may appoint any individual it deems qualified to serve on a Standing or Special Committee.

ARTICLE XII

FINANCES

Section 1:

Fiscal Year. The fiscal year of the Maricopa Association of Governments shall commence on July 1 of each year.

Section 2:

The Maricopa Association of Governments shall have the power to receive from any public or private source including, but not limited to the federal, state, and local governments, voluntary associations, nonprofit corporation, firms, partnerships, or persons or any combination thereof, bequests, donations, devices, grants, and gifts of all kinds of property, including all forms of ownership interest therein, to do all acts necessary to carry out the purposes of such bequests, gifts, grants, devised and donations, with power to manage, sell, convey, contract, lease or otherwise dispose of the same in accordance with the terms of the bequest, gift, grant, donation, device of trust, or absolutely in case such bequest, grant, gift, donation or device of trust be unconditional.

Section 3:

Members of the corporation representing local units of government in Maricopa County AND IN URBANIZED AREAS CONTIGUOUS TO MARICOPA COUNTY shall be responsible for insuring that any service charges assessed by the Regional Council are paid into the association's treasury. All service charges for cities and towns AND INDIAN COMMUNITIES shall be based on population, provided that service charges for cities and towns AND INDIAN COMMUNITIES shall be based on the population within their corporate limits OR TRIBAL BOUNDARY and service charges for Maricopa County shall be based upon population in the unincorporated area of the County, exclusive of Indian communities that are members of Maricopa Association of Governments. ~~Service charges for Indian communities shall be based on population in that portion of the Indian community located in Maricopa County.~~

Section 4:

The Regional Council may assess special service charges for individual studies or projects, sufficient to provide the funds required for the completion of said studies and projects, in addition to any regularly established service charges.

Section 5:

Annual Audit. The Secretary shall cause an annual audit of the financial affairs of the Association to be made by a public accountant or a certified public accountant selected by the Regional Council at the end of each fiscal year. The audit report shall be made available to all members.

ARTICLE XIII

VOTING PROCEDURE FOR THE REGIONAL COUNCIL AND THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Section 1:

(A) The Regional Council and Management Committee shall vote on all motions on the basis of one vote per member, except that the two Arizona Department of Transportation board members for District I on the Regional Council shall each have one vote. However, if any member entity requests a weighted vote, the numerical vote shall have no force or effect unless concurred in by the weighted vote.

(B) When a weighted vote is taken, each member shall have as many votes as the population of the member entity that the member represents bears to the total population of all member entities expressed in percentages. In calculating percentages, fractions of a percent less than one-half or more shall be rounded to the next higher whole number, excepting that no member shall be allocated less than one full percent. Thus each member representing an entity with one percent of the population or less shall have one vote, and each member representing an entity with more than one percent of the population shall have as many votes as that entity's percentage of the population. The affirmative vote of members present representing not less than a majority of the total population of all members present shall be required in order for the motion to pass.

(C) The population of the member entity shall be determined by the most recent decennial or mid-decade special census, excepting that the population of Maricopa County shall be that of the unincorporated portion of Maricopa County only, exclusive of the population of Indian communities within its boundaries that are members of Maricopa Association of Governments. ~~The population of an Indian community is for that portion of the Indian community within Maricopa County.~~ The representatives for the Arizona Department of Transportation vote only on traffic and transportation related issues, do not represent an entity having a population, and shall always have one vote on such issues in a weighted vote. The Chairman of the Citizens Transportation Oversight Committee votes only on issues relating to the regional freeway system, does not represent an entity having a population, and shall always have one vote on such issues in a weighted vote.

(D) Upon receipt of an official decennial or mid-decade special census, or if a new member entity joins Maricopa Association of Governments, the population percentages of each of the member entities, and when applicable the total regional population, shall be recomputed. If an existing member withdraws its membership, the weighted vote shall not be recomputed, but the remaining members shall have the right to vote the number of votes established by the existing percentages.

ARTICLE XV

The seal of the corporation shall be impressed as follows: "Maricopa Association of Governments, incorporated October 24, 1967, Arizona."

ARTICLE XVI

These By-Laws may be amended at any meeting of the Regional Council by a majority vote of all members provided written notice of proposed amendment has been given not less than fifteen (15) days prior to the meeting at which it is to be voted upon.

**Estimated Dues and Assessments by Member Agency
for Fiscal Year 2003
With Apache Junction and Revised Methodology**

Jurisdiction	July 1, 2001 Population Totals	MAG Member Dues	Solid Waste Planning Assessment	Water Quality Planning Assessment	9-1-1 (a) Planning Assessment	Human Services Planning Assessment	Homeless Prevention Assessment	TOTAL Dues & Assessments
Apache Junction	32,800	\$1,771	\$341	\$1,028	\$2,158	\$633		\$5,931
Avondale	40,445	\$2,184	\$420	\$1,268	\$2,661	\$780		\$7,313
Buckeye	10,650	\$575	\$111	\$334	\$701	\$205		\$1,926
Carefree	3,095	\$167	\$32	\$97	\$204	\$60		\$560
Cave Creek	3,900	\$211	\$40	\$122	\$257	\$75		\$705
Chandler	186,875	\$10,091	\$1,941	\$5,859	\$12,295	\$3,607	3,253	\$37,046
El Mirage	11,915	\$643	\$124	\$374	\$784	\$230		\$2,155
Fountain Hills	21,190	\$1,144	\$220	\$664	\$1,394	\$409		\$3,831
Gila Bend	2,000	\$108	\$21	\$63	\$132	\$39		\$363
Gila River Indian Community	11,260	\$608	\$117	\$353	\$741	\$217		\$2,036
Gilbert	122,360	\$6,607	\$1,271	\$3,836	\$8,051	\$2,361	2,130	\$24,256
Glendale	224,970	\$12,148	\$2,336	\$7,054	\$14,802	\$4,341	3,916	\$44,597
Goodyear	22,820	\$1,232	\$237	\$716	\$1,501	\$440		\$4,126
Guadalupe	5,230	\$282	\$54	\$164	\$344	\$101		\$945
Litchfield Park	3,845	\$208	\$40	\$121	\$253	\$74		\$696
Maricopa County (b)	207,325	\$11,195	\$2,153	\$6,500	\$13,641	\$4,000	3,609	\$41,098
Mesa	414,075	\$22,359	\$4,300	\$12,983	\$27,244	\$7,990	7,209	\$82,085
Paradise Valley	13,915	\$751	\$144	\$436	\$916	\$268		\$2,515
Peoria	117,200	\$6,328	\$1,217	\$3,675	\$7,711	\$2,261	2,040	\$23,232
Phoenix	1,344,775	\$72,613	\$13,962	\$42,165		\$25,950	23,412	\$178,102
Queen Creek	4,940	\$267	\$51	\$155	\$324	\$95		\$892
Salt River Pima-Maricopa	6,490	\$350	\$67	\$203	\$427	\$125		\$1,172
Scottsdale	209,960	\$11,337	\$2,180	\$6,583	\$13,814	\$4,051	3,655	\$41,620
Surprise	38,400	\$2,073	\$399	\$1,204	\$2,527	\$741		\$6,944
Tempe	159,435	\$8,609	\$1,656	\$4,999	\$10,490	\$3,076	2,776	\$31,606
Tolleson	5,040	\$272	\$52	\$158	\$332	\$97		\$911
Wickenburg	5,265	\$284	\$55	\$165	\$346	\$102		\$952
Youngtown	3,155	\$170	\$33	\$99	\$208	\$61		\$571
TOTALS	3,233,330	\$174,587	\$33,574	\$101,378	\$124,258	\$62,389	\$52,000	\$548,186

FY 2002 Total Costs		\$167,873	\$32,284	\$97,479	\$119,478	\$59,989	\$50,000	\$527,103
\$ Difference in FY 2002		\$6,714	\$1,290	\$3,899	\$4,780	\$2,400	\$2,000	\$21,083
% Difference in FY 2002		4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
Per Capita Cost		\$0.05400	\$0.01038	\$0.03135	\$0.03843	\$0.01930	\$0.01608	\$0.16954

The annual dues and assessments are apportioned according to per capita populations and are increased using the inflation factor developed for the MAG Regional Freeway System (4.0 percent).

(a) The 9-1-1 assessment is apportioned according to per capita populations excluding the City of Phoenix.

(b) The Maricopa County portion of the dues and assessments includes the balance of the county, excluding Gila River Indian Community and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (except when calculating the Homeless Prevention assessment).
The Homeless Prevention assessment is only charged to CDBG recipients with populations over eight cities 50,000.

**Estimated Dues and Assessments by Member Agency
for Fiscal Year 2003
Existing - without Apache Junction**

Jurisdiction	July 1, 2001 Population Totals	MAG Member Dues	Solid Waste Planning Assessment	Water Quality Planning Assessment	9-1-1 (a) Planning Assessment	Human Services Planning Assessment	Homeless Prevention Assessment	TOTAL Dues & Assessments
Avondale	40,445	\$2,212	\$425	\$1,284	\$2,720	\$790		\$7,431
Buckeye	10,650	\$582	\$112	\$338	\$716	\$208		\$1,956
Carefree	3,095	\$169	\$33	\$98	\$208	\$60		\$568
Cave Creek	3,900	\$213	\$41	\$124	\$262	\$76		\$716
Chandler	186,875	\$10,220	\$1,966	\$5,935	\$12,569	\$3,653	3,253	\$37,596
El Mirage	11,915	\$652	\$125	\$378	\$801	\$233		\$2,189
Fountain Hills	21,190	\$1,159	\$223	\$673	\$1,425	\$414		\$3,894
Gila Bend	2,000	\$109	\$21	\$64	\$135	\$39		\$368
Gila River Indian Community	2,700	\$148	\$28	\$86	\$182	\$53		\$497
Gilbert	122,360	\$6,692	\$1,287	\$3,886	\$8,230	\$2,391	2,130	\$24,616
Glendale	224,970	\$12,304	\$2,366	\$7,145	\$15,131	\$4,397	3,916	\$45,259
Goodyear	22,820	\$1,248	\$240	\$725	\$1,535	\$446		\$4,194
Guadalupe	5,230	\$286	\$55	\$166	\$352	\$102		\$961
Litchfield Park	3,845	\$210	\$40	\$122	\$259	\$75		\$706
Maricopa County (b)	207,600	\$11,354	\$2,183	\$6,593	\$13,963	\$4,057	3,614	\$41,764
Mesa	414,075	\$22,646	\$4,355	\$13,150	\$27,850	\$8,093	7,208	\$83,302
Paradise Valley	13,915	\$761	\$146	\$442	\$936	\$272		\$2,557
Peoria	117,200	\$6,410	\$1,233	\$3,722	\$7,883	\$2,291	2,040	\$23,579
Phoenix	1,344,775	\$73,547	\$14,145	\$42,707		\$26,282	23,409	\$180,090
Queen Creek	4,940	\$270	\$52	\$157	\$332	\$97		\$908
Salt River Pima-Maricopa	6,490	\$355	\$68	\$206	\$437	\$127		\$1,193
Scottsdale	209,960	\$11,483	\$2,208	\$6,668	\$14,121	\$4,103	3,655	\$42,238
Surprise	38,400	\$2,100	\$404	\$1,219	\$2,583	\$750		\$7,056
Tempe	159,435	\$8,720	\$1,677	\$5,063	\$10,723	\$3,116	2,775	\$32,074
Tolleson	5,040	\$276	\$53	\$160	\$339	\$99		\$927
Wickenburg	5,265	\$288	\$55	\$167	\$354	\$103		\$967
Youngtown	3,155	\$173	\$33	\$100	\$212	\$62		\$580
TOTALS	3,192,245	\$174,587	\$33,574	\$101,378	\$124,258	\$62,389	\$52,000	\$548,186
FY 2002 Total Costs		\$167,873	\$32,284	\$97,479	\$119,478	\$59,989	\$50,000	\$527,103
\$ Difference in FY 2002		\$6,714	\$1,290	\$3,899	\$4,780	\$2,400	\$2,000	\$21,083
% Difference in FY 2002		4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%	4.00%
Per Capita Cost		\$0.05469	\$0.01052	\$0.03176	\$0.03892	\$0.01954	\$0.01629	\$0.17172

The annual dues and assessments are apportioned according to per capita populations and are increased using the inflation factor developed for the MAG Regional Freeway System (4.0 percent).

(a) The 9-1-1 assessment is apportioned according to per capita populations excluding the City of Phoenix.

(b) The Maricopa County portion of the dues and assessments includes the balance of the county excluding the Gila River Indian Community and the Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community (except when calculating the Homeless Prevention assessment). The Homeless Prevention assessment is only charged to CDBG recipients with populations over eight cities 50,000.